

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

DEC 5 1927

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. J. P. DOBSON, M.A., Chairman.

L. WHIBLEY, M.A., Hon. Secretary.

Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A., Hon. Treasurer.
Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A. } With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.

E. A. BARBER, M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society.
D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago;

Prof. MAURICE HUTTON, University of Toronto;

Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XLI

NOVEMBER, 1927

No. 5

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
DIOUNSIS, GUARDIAN OF THE DITHRERA, AND DIONYSOS DITHYRAMBOS. W. M. CALDER 161		REVIEWS (continued):	
Electra AGAIN. J. T. SHEPPARD 163		Plato V. (Lamb). W. L. LORIMER .. 180	
BUCOLICA. A. S. F. GOW 166		The Growth of Criminal Law in Ancient Greece (Calhoun). W. R. HALLIDAY .. 181	
THE LYRA OF ORPHEUS. A. D. NOCK .. 169		Some Works on Ancient Philosophy. A. E. TAYLOR 182	
CICERO, <i>Pro Sestio</i> VIII. 18, AND THE 'COLUMNA RHEGIA.' R. B. ONIANS .. 171		Histoire du Parfait Grec (Châtraine). R. MCKENZIE 184	
ON THE TEXT AND INTERPRETATION OF HORACE, S. II. i. 185 f. D. A. SLATER 172		Die Lateinische Reimprosa (Polheim). A. C. CLARK 184	
LATIN <i>himileus</i> , <i>himilus</i> (?), 'PAWN.' J. WHATMOUGH 174		Catalogue of the Engraved Gems .. in the British Museum (Walters). A. B. COOK 186	
SOPHOCLES O.T. 1511-1514. A. C. PEARSON 175		Greek Papyri in the Library of Cornell Uni- versity (Westermann and Kraemer). H. I. BELL 188	
CICERO, <i>Oration</i> , 132. A. SOUTER 175		The Development of Virgil's Art (Prescott). J. W. MACKAIL 188	
TACITUS, <i>Agricola</i> , XXVIII. 2. J. H. ILIFFE 175		Lucain I-V (Bourgery). A. E. HOUSMAN .. 189	
REVIEWS:		Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres. I. 6, II. 1-5 (Diehl). A. D. NOCK 191	
Die Heimkehr des Odysseus (Wilamowitz). A. SHEWAN 176		Myth and Constantine the Great (Burch). A. SOUTER 192	
Monolog und Selbstgespräch (Schadewaldt). J. T. SHEPPARD 177		The Magic Staff or Rod in Graeco-Italian An- tiquity (de Waele). H. J. ROSE 193	
Aeschylus and Sophocles: Their Work and Influence (Sheppard); Lucian: Satirist and Artist (Allinson). A. S. OWEN 178		Arte Etrusca (Ducati e Giglioli). A. S. F. GOW 194	
The Great War between Athens and Sparta (Henderson). M. CARY 179		Some Class-Books. W. E. P. PANTIN .. 195	
SHORT REVIEWS 197-207			
CORRESPONDENCE 207			
BOOKS RECEIVED 207			

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present Number, 2s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3.
Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW
25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. F. Hose, Dulwich College, S.E. 21; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Dr. E. Norman Gardiner, 186, Woodstock Road, Oxford, and Miss E. C. Gedge, Crayford Rectory, Kent; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. F. H. Sandbach, The University, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Mr. R. B. Onians, The University, Liverpool; Professor Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. H. A. Pitman, 4, Prince's Buildings, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. J. Vaughan, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, Fernshaw, Hilary Road, Llanishen, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Mrs. Jackson, The Cottage, Cordwell Valley, Holmesfield, Nr. Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss M. K. Wakefield, Maidstone Girls' Grammar School, Kent; Mr. S. Price, 33, Walton Well Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gaussen, 16, Lewes Crescent, Brighton; Mr. G. W. Dyson, University College, Southampton; Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; Mr. C. W. Baty, 40, Waterloo Road, Bedford; and Mr. J. E. Scott, Caius College, Cambridge.

BOOKS FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

86 CHARING CROSS ROAD
LONDON, W.C. 2.

A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITIES

Based on Sir Wm. Smith's larger Dictionary, and incorporating the Results of Modern Research. Edited by F. WARRE CORNISH, M.A., Vice-Provost of Eton College. With over 1,100 Illustrations taken from the best examples of Ancient Art. 25s. net.

This Dictionary forms a companion volume to the *Classical Dictionary*. In the revised edition the results of recent discoveries, as well as the researches of English and foreign scholars, have been incorporated.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE ST., LONDON, W. 1.

SECOND IMPRESSION

CLASSICAL STUDIES

By J. W. MACKAIL, M.A., LL.D.

Contents: THE PLACE OF GREEK AND LATIN IN HUMAN LIFE—THE REPORT OF THE PRIME MINISTER'S COMMITTEE ON THE CLASSICS IN EDUCATION—WHAT IS THE GOOD OF GREEK?—PELEPOLE IN THE "ODYSSEY"—THE ALLIANCE OF LATIN AND ENGLISH STUDIES—VIRGIL'S ITALY—THE VIRGILIAN UNDERWORLD—THE "ODES" OF HORACE—THE LAST GREAT ROMAN HISTORIAN—THE CLASSICS—THE PLACE OF THE CLASSICS IN IMPERIAL STUDIES—PATRIOTISM.

7s. 6d. net.

JOHN MURRAY ALBEMARLE STREET LONDON, W. 1

THE
OF
RIES
AST
IAL
et.
I

E
V
R

an
co
li

E
A
A
I
I

I

CAMBRIDGE BOOKS

Recently Published



THE CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY

Edited by J. B. BURY, M.A., F.B.A., S. A. COOK, Litt.D., and F. E. ADCOCK, M.A.
Volume of Plates I (illustrating Volumes I—IV). Prepared by C. T. SELTMAN, M.A.
Royal 8vo. 25s net.

'As a continuous pictorial view of the progress of civilization from the Stone Age to the literary and artistic genius of Athens in the age of the triumph over Xerxes, this work is a wonderful array of expert commentaries accompanying the different sets of illustrations. As a collection under one cover nothing like it exists.'—*The Observer*.

FIVE ROMAN EMPERORS : VESPASIAN, TITUS, DOMITIAN, NERVA, TRAJAN. A.D. 69–117.

By BERNARD W. HENDERSON, M.A., D.Litt. With 4 maps. Demy 8vo. 21s net.

A CRETAN STATUETTE IN THE FITZWILLIAM MUSEUM

A Study in Minoan Costume. By A. J. B. WACE. With 13 plates and 2 text-figures.
Demy 4to. 10s 6d net.

THE OLD LATIN TEXTS OF THE HEPTATEUCH

By Rev A. V. BILLEN, M.A., D.D. (Oxford), Ph.D. (London). Demy 8vo. 15s net.

GREEK PROSE COMPOSITION

By J. ARBUTHNOT NAIRN, D.Litt. Crown 8vo. School edition, 6s. (Library edition,
with the author's own versions of the passages provided for translation. 10s 6d net.)

APOLLONIUS RHODIUS : THE STORY OF MEDEA

Book III and Book IV, lines 1–211 of the *Argonautica*. Edited by J. H. E. CREES,
M.A., D.Litt., and J. C. WORDSWORTH, M.A. Foolscap 8vo. 3s 6d. (*Pitt Press
Series: Greek*.)

PRIMUM GRAIUS HOMO

An Anthology of Latin translations from the Greek from Ennius to Livy, with an introductory essay and a running commentary by B. FARRINGTON, M.A. Crown 4to.
8s 6d net.

A COMPANION TO LATIN STUDIES

Edited by Sir JOHN EDWIN SANDYS, Litt.D., F.B.A. Third Edition, reprinted. With
141 illustrations, 2 maps, and 4 indexes. Royal 8vo. 27s 6d net.



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

FETTER LANE, LONDON, E.C. 4



IMPERIAL ROME

By M. P. NILSSON, Professor of Classical Archaeology, University of Lund.
TRANSLATED by the Rev. G. C. RICHARDS, D.D. Post 8vo. 24 Plates and a Map. 21s. net.

Dr. T. Hudson-Williams (Professor of Greek, University College, Bangor): 'When we consider the long span covered by this single volume (44 B.C.—48 A.D.), we are amazed at the ease and lucidity with which the vast subject is put before us. Everywhere we see evidence of the author's extensive reading and critical examination of the earliest sources available. . . . He has a happy gift of deftly summarising an epoch and illustrating his points by well-chosen little details charged with a real human interest. . . .'

THE PLAYS OF TERENCE

Translated into parallel English metres by WILLIAM RITCHIE, D.Litt., Professor of Latin in the University of Cape Town. Crown 4to. 21s. net.

'Professor Ritchie gives us the text of the plays, and on the opposite page a translation in scrupulously parallel metres. His version . . . has the agreeable result of imparting a briskness very expressive of the spirit of the comedies.'—*Observer*.

'Scholars will admire the cleverness and fidelity of his versions.'—*Sunday Times*.

'Professor Ritchie's verse has an agreeable flavour which is drawn from the original, and in reading him we feel that here is one who has at least imposed on himself a discipline not unlike that to which Terence himself submitted.'—*The Times*.

BELL'S CONCISE LATIN COURSE [New], Part II.

By E. C. MARCHANT, M.A., Sub-Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, and F. H. PHILPOT, B.A., Cheltenham College. [Ready shortly.]

This book provides an entirely new continuation of Bell's Concise Latin Course, Part I. (Seventeenth Edition, price 3s.), but is so arranged that it may equally well be used after any other first-year course. It includes all the syntax that can be covered in the second year of Latin, including relative clauses in *Oratio Obliqua*. The rules are stated in the plainest language, without the use of technical terms of grammar. Some of the exercises consist of miscellaneous sentences, others of sentences that are continuous in sense: but nearly all are kept as simple as possible.

A FIRST LATIN POETRY BOOK

Selected and edited by JOHN ELWYN JAMES, M.A., Headmaster of Canton Secondary School, Cardiff. 2s.

A selection, lyrical and epigrammatical, of 49 poems or extracts from Latin Poetry from Lucretius to Boethius. The editor has added an introduction, notes, vocabulary, etc.

'We recommend this pleasing selection of Latin poems. The selection itself is excellent, the notes are concise. . . . Should prove a useful school book.'—*Journal of Education*.

LIVY, BOOK II, Chapters 27—47

Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary by M. KEAN, M.A. Illustrated. [Bell's Illustrated Classics.]

The latest addition to this well-known series contains the chapters set for the School Certificate and Matriculation Examinations of the Northern Universities Joint Board, 1928. The editor has carefully borne in mind the needs of pupils studying for these and similar examinations.

BELL'S SHORTER CLASSICS

Edited by H. H. HARDY, M.A., Headmaster of Cheltenham College.

These volumes contain selected passages worked up into a connected narrative by means of summaries in English which effectively continue the narrative and yet save time being spent in reading long translated passages. The work can thus be read as a whole and the story appreciated. Latest volumes:

The Shorter Livy, Books XXXI—XXXV. Edited by A. C. B. BROWN, M.A., Marlborough College. With or without vocabulary. 2s. 6d.

The Shorter Iliad, Books I—XII. Edited by H. H. HARDY, M.A. [In the press.]
Sophocles: Philoctetes. Edited by C. E. LAURENCE, M.A. 2s.

Classics Catalogue post free on request

YORK HOUSE, PORTUGAL ST., LONDON, W.C. 2

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1927

DIOUNYSIS, GUARDIAN OF THE DITHRERA, AND DIONYSOS DITHYRAMBOS.

IN C.R. XXXVI., pp. 11 ff., it was pointed out that the foreign word διθύραμβος, and the thing which it signified, were brought to Corinth by Arion of Lesbos; that other early evidence connected the διθύραμβος with the sea-route from Asia Minor to the Saronic Gulf; that the διθύραμβος was regularly set to Phrygian music; and that a recently discovered Phrygian inscription contained the word διθρέπα, 'tomb,' giving an obvious etymology for διθύραμβος, for which no sane 'Greek' etymology had ever been suggested. It might have been added that Euripides, in the *Bacchae*, derived the Dionysus in whose service he had laboured for close on fifty years, not from Thrace but from Lydia and Phrygia.¹ This theory, involving the ultimate origin of the Greek drama in Anatolian grave ritual, and establishing the kinship of the ἔξαρχοντες τὸν διθύραμβον of the *Poetics* with the θρήνων ἔξαρχοι of *Iliad* XXIV. 721, set the stage for a handsome *anagnorisis* between Dionysus and the late Sir William Ridgeway; but Ridgeway was not convinced, and the writer took his advice to think over the theory for a year before publishing it. To Ridgeway, indeed, who had already denied the original and exclusive association of the dithyramb with Dionysus, a derivation which seemed reasonable in itself might well have appealed. For the writer, and doubtless for others, a stumbling-block in the way of the derivation of διθύραμβος from διθρέπαμβος was that it involved a Phrygian or Anatolian Dionysus as guardian of the grave. For such a phase in the history of the god Dionysus, natural as it seemed to the student of Phrygian religion, there was no direct evidence. The name of Dionysus was a stranger to the tablets of Boghaz Kōi. This

in itself was not surprising, for the Thracian associations of the god pointed rather to a Thrako-Phrygian connexion. But the Phrygian inscriptions were as silent as the Boghaz Kōi tablets. And so the Dionysus of tragedy remained the original wine-god from Thrace, and the dithyramb remained the Peloponnesian chorus chanted to him in that capacity. I am not aware that the origin of διθύραμβος in διθρέπαμβος has been accepted, or even rejected, by anybody.²

A pretty tombstone found in 1925 at Baghlija, on the territory of Orcistus in north-eastern Phrygia, is about to be published as No. 413 in *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, Vol. I, the first publication of the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor. The inscription on this tombstone runs as follows:

Ἄρ. Μηνόδαλος Οἰσενόστου κὲ Μα-
ρια Ἀρρέχον ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Ἀππη καὶ
Οἰναινη τέκνον δώρος καὶ
ἔαντοις μνήμης χάριν (leaf) ιος

¹ Cf. also Athenaeus XIV. 626a.
² This article was printed before the appearance of Mr. Pickard-Cambridge's *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*. To have reduced so acute and so stern a critic of 'origin theories' to suspension of judgment (pp. 16, 419) is no small feat. His outstanding objections are, I think, three: (1) The difficulty of deriving διθύραμβος from a Phrygian word διθρέπα, which must correspond morphologically to a Greek *διθύρα. I must apologise for not having pointed out earlier that in the rude verse in which it occurs διθρέπα must be scanned as a dactyl. (2) The difficulty that Dionysus had no association with grave ritual in Greece. This raises a larger question than can be discussed here. Let two sentences suffice: Assuming, as the absence of his name from the Boghaz Kōi records makes probable, that D. was originally a Thrako-Phrygian (vegetation) deity, his association with grave ritual was inevitable in Anatolia, but not in Greece. Assuming, on the other hand, that D. was originally a local version of the Anatolian Peasant-god, he had as little need to appear in Greece with all his Anatolian attributes as, e.g., the Anatolian Artemis. (3) The lateness of the evidence. This objection is, I hope, met below.

5 νι σεμουν κρουμαρει κακε
αδακετ αυρω Ονεραονις τιγ-
γεγαρτμενο(;) ειτον πουρ Οναρ-
κταν κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ Διουνσιν.
και Αδρ. Σώζοντι Κακκαρου άνδρι της Ονεραονίης.

The text (impression, two photographs, and copy) is certain throughout. The last letter but two in l. 8 was copied doubtfully as *epsilon*; the impression is decisive for *sigma*. L. 9 is a later addition.

This inscription dates from the later half of the third century A.D.; like the great majority of the Neo-Phrygian inscriptions, it consists of a dedication in Greek followed by a *devotio* in Phrygian. The protasis of the *devotio* is of the stock type, with the exception that *αυρω Ονεραονις* is added to *κνουμαρει*, proving once for all that this word means 'tomb.' The apodosis clearly means 'let him be devoted to the Lord (of the Underworld) and he shall . . . the heavenly Diounsis.' On *γεγαρτμενος*, compounded here with the particle or preposition (*ε*)*τι*, elsewhere prefixed to *τετικμενος*, see *J.H.S.* XLVI., 1926, p. 24, No. LXXIX., where it is shown that the word is translated by, or Phrygianised from, the Greek (*ἐν*)*κεχαρισμένος*. As between *Πουρου ανακταν* and *πουρ Ονανακταν* the balance is perhaps tilted in favour of the latter by the personal name *Οναναξος* or *Οναναξων* (*J.H.S.* XIX., 1899, p. 300, No. 223 and references). Just as the nature goddess was called *Fanova* in Pamphylia, so *πουρ Ονανακταν* corresponds to Greek (*παρά?*) *ἀνακτα*, the Old Phrygian *Fanaktau*, the King of the dead, graecised as *Mήν Τύραννος* or *Mήν καταχθόνιος*. But *Πουρου* may be the god's name (*cf.* *Καρον*, *Τιαμον*, etc.), and *ανακταν* his title. The division *ουρανιον ισγεικετ Διουνσιν* is not open to doubt. Whatever *ισγεικετ* means (*ἔνοχος ἔσται?* *ἔξει πρός?*) the Greek¹ adjective *ουρανιον* in this context shows that *Διουνσιν* is the name of a second god who is invoked to protect the grave.

This inscription dates between 250 and 300 A.D. (see *J.H.S.* XLVI., 1926, p. 22 and references). Is *Διουνσιν* a

broken-down form, due to Phrygian pronunciation or rural illiteracy, of the Greek *Διόνυσος*? The answer to this question involves a consideration of the linguistic and religious character of the Neo-Phrygian inscriptions. Their vocabulary and the variety of their syntactical forms show that these inscriptions represent a living and spoken language, although both vocabulary (*e.g.* *κακον*, *κακουν*, *κακεν*, *κακε*) and syntax (*e.g.* *κε* is both interposed and enclitic) naturally show the influence of Greek. They all date from the later third century, and have been found mainly on the Imperial estates in eastern Phrygia. The writer has argued elsewhere² that this revival of the epigraphical use of the Phrygian language for a religious purpose was part of the anti-Christian revivalist policy of the Imperial owners of those estates, and falls into line with the other activities of the Tekmoreian Association (on which see Ramsay, *Stud. E.R.P.*, pp. 305 ff.; *J.R.S.* VIII., pp. 107 ff.). In spite of a slight admixture of Greek forms, the language of the Neo-Phrygian inscriptions bears a strong resemblance to the Old Phrygian texts of the monument country and of Euyuk (see especially *J.H.S.* XXXIII., 1913, p. 101, No. LXXI.).

In one respect these inscriptions are strikingly conservative.

To avoid the appearance of special pleading, I will quote a paragraph written in a different context in 1923:³ 'It is an interesting fact that the Old Anatolian deities are practically never called by their Anatolian names in the Graeco-Roman epigraphy of Asia Minor. Ma, Ba, Cybele, Agdistis, Attis, Papas, etc., the characteristic names in the Old Anatolian religion, hardly appear, or do not appear at all, in the local Greek inscriptions. Yet there can be no doubt that those names continued in use. The case of Attis may be taken as typical. This god is frequently mentioned on inscriptions belonging to his imported cult in Greece and Italy; in

¹ *Oυρανός* has no 'etymology,' and may be an Anatolian loan-word. *Oυρανός* may quite well be Phrygian (Fraser).

² *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, VIII., 1924, p. 352.

³ *Journal of the Manchester E. and O. Soc.*, No. XI., 1924, p. 23.

his Anatolian home, so far as I know, he is [possibly, but not certainly] mentioned on one Lydian-Greek inscription. This fact calls for explanation, and the following explanation may be offered. The old name of the god, the name of power, was used by speakers of the native languages; by speakers of Greek it was used only in the mysteries. This was in itself a reason for its suppression on public monuments; a further reason for the use of Greek divine names in the public and official cult (the one almost exclusively represented in epigraphy) is that Greek was the official language of the cities of Asia Minor and the language of all educated people. The Lydian inscription referred to above [if it mentions Attis] mentions Attis in connexion with the mysteries. That the god who is called *Mén* (which in this connexion may be classed with Greek names) in Greek dedications and curse-formulae in Phrygia continued to be called Attis by those who used the Phrygian language is definitely proved by the Neo-Phrygian inscriptions, in many of which the violator of the tomb is devoted to Attis—*Attie tetikmenos etou*. Readers of Demosthenes will remember his description (in the *De Corona*, § 260) of the Phrygian mysteries as practised at Athens, in which the initiate is said to dance to the refrain “Hyes Attes Attes Hyes”; this contemptuous description is of value as showing that in one case the native Anatolian name of a god was invoked in the mysteries. From this instance we may confidently deduce the general practice.’

The deities mentioned in the Neo-Phrygian inscriptions so far discovered are Wanax, Diounsis, Attis, Ma, Astia,

Ba (or Pountasba), Mitraphata, Enstaradoumth, and very doubtfully Gdika, sometimes summed up as δεως κε ζεμελος, the θεοι οντάνοι καὶ καταχθόνοι of the Greek *devotiones*.

These, with the very doubtful exception of Gdika, are non-Greek, and Anatolian or Phrygian names. It would be contrary to all analogy to treat Διουνσις as a broken-down form of the Greek word Διόνυσος. To those who incline to this view I would recommend a study of the Imperial religious epigraphy of Phrygia; personally I know no instance of a god's name or title being bowdlerised. Diounsis is clearly the Phrygian name of the god¹ worshipped by the Greeks as Dionysos (originally Διόνυσος), and by the Thracians as Zonnyxos. To inquire whether Dionysus originally migrated from Thrace into Phrygia or from Phrygia into Thrace is neither profitable nor for our purpose necessary. It suffices for us that he was a late arrival in Greece, and that διθύραμβος was both his title and his hymn.

We now know that the Phrygians appealed to a god called Διουνσις to protect the διθύρα. The historians of the drama may be left to draw their own conclusions.

W. M. CALDER.

¹ It is not necessarily the exact form of the name as used in Phrygia early in the first millennium B.C., although the other divine names used in the Neo-Phrygian texts preserve the ancient forms. These texts even go out of their way to introduce the famous *βεκός* of Hdt. II. 2.

² The ordinary prose words for the ‘tomb’ and ‘monument’ are *κρονίαν* and *μαντία*. The form διθύρα occurs in a verse inscription, and is probably ancient. Dithyrambos as a title points to *Dithran-bas, ‘Lord of the Tomb’, cf. Lycabas, Korybas, etc.

ELECTRA AGAIN.

MR. OWEN is a sympathetic critic. When he calls Electra’s triumph at her mother’s death ‘most poignant’ in its contrast with her loving nature, he drives straight at the heart of Schlegel’s misbegotten progeny, the ‘happy matricide.’ He sheathes his weapon, and the monster whispers, ‘Yes, the matricide was in the story. Sophocles could

not ignore it, and, of course, he felt the horror. But he didn’t mean you to “dwell on it.” The vengeance is directed mainly at Aegisthus, whose arrest and execution, not the matricide (a mere *parergon*, I assure you), “crowns the whole.” The Chorus tells you, “All is well.” Why doubt it? Don’t be modern, psychological, Euripidean.’

For the moment Mr. Owen seems to waver. I have hopes that he will yet obey his own good instinct and defy the fiend. It is not true that in the structure of this play the shadow of the coming matricide is negligible. Hint after sinister hint leads up in rhythmical progression to the sudden horror. In her monody Electra tells of the foul murder done 'by my own mother and her bedfellow Aegisthus,' then invokes the Furies, 'Come! Avenge our father's murder.' In the Kommos she repeats the curse, invoking Zeus (209). It shocks the Chorus. Why the dual and the plural if she did not think of Clytaemnestra, but Aegisthus only? 'If they pay not death for death,' she says, 'it is the end of modesty and righteousness.' She bids Chrysothemis pray for vengeance, 'May Orestes, living, trample on his father's foes' (456). To the interpretation of that line the reference to Clytaemnestra's death in 437 is not irrelevant. Finally, in the clash of mother and child, Electra, under stress of passion, cries, 'If life for life is to be taken, you yourself will be the first to die!' (582); and then, 'You say I cherish'd him to kill you. Yes, if I could I would!' That is the climax. *σοὶ τρέφειν μάστορα*, she says, and means it. There is no linguistic evidence for Mr. Owen's view. Having said it, she recognises in herself with shame her mother's murderous spirit.

The Queen prays. The Paedagogue appears. Electra's hopes and Clytaemnestra's fears are banished.

That is the first dramatic series. The second is parallel in form, but different in effect. First a monologue, 'Orestes dead! There is no hope of vengeance. Let me die!' Then a Kommos as before. But now the Chorus take the lead. 'Where are the bolts of Zeus?' They rouse Electra. 'Amphiaraus was betrayed to death, but the fell woman . . .' 'Perished,' Electra answers; 'for he had an avenger.' Mr. Owen's mild interpretation, 'overpowered,' ignores the fact of Eriphyle's story and destroys the point. To Chrysothemis Electra says, 'Help me to kill Aegisthus!' Here at last distinction is made, and for good reason. But the Chorus mean by διδύμαν ἐλούσ' Ερινύν, 'She will kill

them both!' The scene with Orestes is a revelation of Electra's love, contrasted sharply with the corresponding scene—the interview with Clytaemnestra. Loving grief at first, then loving joy, for this brief moment banish hate. The Paedagogue breaks in. The men go, and Electra follows with a prayer which terribly reminds us of her mother's impious appeal, 'Help us, Apollo, in this enterprise!' Does not the ambiguity enhance our apprehensive pity while the Chorus, weaving phrases from the *Agamemnon* (966 ff.) with the echoes of their own first Stasimon, await the crowning act?

The choral introduction would alone suffice to mark this moment as the climax. All that went before led up to it. What follows is the tragic aftermath. Clytaemnestra's cries, Electra's frightful answers, and the meeting with Orestes when the deed is done, are 'the most poignant thing in the play.'

The poet blundered strangely if he meant to make the last scene happy. After each climax of hate throughout the play there comes reaction. What is the sequel here? Lights or no lights, the dead body of the murdered mother lies before us as a silent witness while we watch—with fear and pity, I repeat—the Hubris of Electra, hating still and unashamed at last, but also sick of life's futility. 'A little time! With lives fast bound to wrong . . .', and the vain hectoring of the lost Orestes, mad, not with remorse, but with the lust of killing. 'That should be the way with all who think to go beyond the law. Kill them! The world will be less villainous!' Is this 'the attitude' of a 'stern, unquestioning' judge? Let him look to himself. It ill becomes a matricide. *κεκόλληται γένος πρὸς ἄτα*. As Jebb said, no optimistic phrases from the Chorus can avail to banish memories of Aeschylus.

Aegisthus' words (1498),

ἢ πᾶσ' ἀνάγκη τίνει τὴν στέγην ιδεῖν
τά τ' ὑπα καὶ μέλλοντα Πελοπεῖῶν κακά;

'need mean no more,' says Mr. Owen, than that 'as the House has seen the death of Clytaemnestra, so it should see his own.' The phrase τά τ' ὄντα καὶ μέλλοντα seems, he says, 'to have

been familiar.' Yes, every word here has its memories (see, for instance, *Ag.* 1185). Sophocles often used familiar words for their associations, making a phrase do duty for a paragraph, painting allusively, as Aeschylus did, but on a smaller canvas with a finer brush. *Ion* 7 and *Helena* 14 will teach us something. Apollo prophesies, and Theonoe, such is her virtue, knows, 'what is and is to be.' This is the Attic version of the words which Homer made immortal when he told how Agamemnon scorned 'the best of prophets, him who knew τά τ' ἔντα τά τ' ἐσόμενα πρό τ' ἔοντα.' So much, by the way, for the definite article: a poet's lines must scan. 'The present and the future ills of the Pelopids' are not, by Attic standards, one day's work, nor yet one generation's. All the evils of this House, haunted by shame and anguish since Myrtillus was drowned, are present to the mind of this doomed man. He is fey, and speaks the truth. Not for nothing did the poet make Electra cry, 'In god's name, brother, do not let him talk!' If you think the 'hint' too 'vague' to be artistic, wait and hear Orestes' answer:

ΟΡ. τὰ γοῦν σ'. ἐγὼ σοι μάντις εἰμι τῶνδ' ἄκρος.
ΑΕΓ. Δλλ' οὐ πατρόφαν τὴν τέχνην ἐκμπασας.

What answer is there to that?

I submit that my interpretation is accordant not with modern feeling only, but with normal Greek linguistic usage, with the rigour of the tragic situation, with those hints of a misreading of the oracles of God—a tragic *ἀμαρτία* indeed—which have been sounding, φωνάεντα συνετοῖσι, from the prologue to the epilogue, and with the ancient wisdom which was not exclusively Euripidean. Sophocles meant his words to bear their natural meaning.

So he did in that earlier passage where the Chorus, in my view, were 'out of their reckoning.' They hailed the Queen's dream as an omen 'breathing joy.' They were full of θράσος. Caution is a better guide for would-be prophets. Vengeance would come, they said, with the tramp of an army—πολύχειρ καὶ πολύποντος (488)—or did they simply mean 'swift to pursue and strong to strike'? Yes, if πολύχειρ in

normal usage means 'strong-handed' and not 'many-handed.' Yes, if adjectives made out of πολύς and a noun have normally that shade of meaning. Yes, if Xerxes, when he went to battle πολύχειρ καὶ πολυναύτης, was a 'handy man and a great sailor.' I prefer, with Blomfield, *Pers.* 83, to think he marched with a great army, sailed with a strong fleet. Add Hdt. VII. 12, Thuc. II. 77, Eur. *Heracleid.* 157, Hesych. πολυχειρία· πλήθος ἐργαζομένων καὶ ἀνυότων.

οὐ κομπάσαιμ' ἀν θεσφάτων γνώμων ἄκρος εἴναι, said the sagacious Chorus in the *Agamemnon* (1122-3): 'I am no great judge of signs, but this looks bad.' The phrase, we see, had haunted Sophocles. Why should we torture language to acquit his Chorus of the human blindness which he emphasised by the last words of play after play? Think of *Ajax* 1499; *O.T.* 1529, 'Don't congratulate too soon'; *Antig.* 1350, 'Don't boast too soon'; *Trach.* 1270, τὰ μὲν οὖν μέλλοντ' οὐδεὶς ἐφορᾷ, τὰ δὲ νῦν . . . Hyllus sees only the shame and agony, not the destined apotheosis. The *Oedipus at Colonus* ends with comfort, 'Weep no more, ἔχει τάδε κύρος.' It ends also with the departure of Antigone to meet a fate unknown to her, but known to us who know the sequel. The Chorus in the *Electra* sees the material victory, and hopes loyally for the best.

We are all human. Mr. Owen thinks our darkened stage and gloomy atmosphere recalled the end of the *Electra* of Euripides. But Euripides ended the play with a bright theophany. We ourselves—no one knows better than the Cambridge actors and producers—missed something of the Sophoclean reserve. We had no masks, and young men's faces are not easily schooled to hide emotion by this world's technique. It is a generous fault. Yet had the play been acted in the air of Athens behind masks, impassive, enigmatical, but with a fixed expression, be it noted, by no means of satisfaction (see *El.* 1310 ff.), the imagination might have still responded to the poet's own hints of the chaos ruling in those tragic souls.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

BUCOLICA.

THEOCR. 7. 59:

ἀλκυόνες, γλαυκάις Νηρῆσι ταὶ τὰ μάλιστα
δρυίχων ἐφίληθεν, δοσοῖς τέ περ ἐξ ἀλὸς ἄγρα.

'Dearest of sea birds to the Nereids.' The sense is well enough, but the limitation in 60 is no ornament. Virgil's *dilectae Thetidi alcynes* would not be improved even in sense by writing *dilectissimae uolucrum marinorum*. Reflecting, therefore, that there are mortals who, after all, have more cause than any Nereid to thank the Halcyons, and that Theocritus has defined one of them with the words *ἐξ ἀλὸς φίλων* (*Beren.* 2; cf. Moschus 5. 10), I concluded that we should write *δοσοῖς*, 'dearest of birds to Nereids and to fisherfolk,' to the improvement both of the sense and, unless I am mistaken, of the phrasing.¹ I did not expect to be first in the field with this proposal, nor am I. It was made, though for other reasons, by Greverus in 1830, and again by Adert in 1843. Twenty-two years later Fritzsch announced that they would not have made it if they had remembered the note in Meineke's second edition, and since then the suggestion has been no more seen of men.

Meineke's second edition appeared in 1836 (so Greverus, at any rate, may be excused for not remembering it); it contains nothing which is not repeated in the third, where you may read that *τέ περ* with relatives, though much less common than *πέρι τε*, has parallels, and need not be altered. And it is true that Greverus and Adert were driven to write *δοσοῖς*, as Valckenaer and Brunck were driven to other expedients, by the supposed difficulty of *τέ*, and Meineke's note removes that ground for alteration. In my opinion, however, *δοσοῖς* deserves consideration upon the quite different grounds given above.

In Meineke's three examples of *τέ περ*, *τέ* is not a copula, for he is only concerned with the words as appendages of a relative. Whether there are examples in which it is a copula I neither know nor greatly care. Elsewhere in T. *τε* with *δοσοῖς* is always a copula

(15. 117, 24. 112), and he does not mind separating *περ* from the word to which it belongs (2. 34, 5. 52, 7. 4). If, as I think, he here wrote *δοσοῖς τέ περ*, I conceive him to have needed no further authority for doing so. And with so many feminine nouns about, the change of gender was almost inevitable.

Theocr. 7. 69:

καὶ πλομαὶ μαλακῶι μεμναμένος Ἀγεάνακτος
ἀνάσσιν κυλίκεστι καὶ ἐς τρύγα χεῖλος φελῶν.

Those editors who retain *ἀνταῖσιν*, though they sometimes explain how the words are to be taken, do not state what they think the meaning to be; and some of their explanations at any rate are incompatible with my view of the sense. I take the dative to belong to the first participle, and the sense to be: Remembering Ageanax in the very act of drinking, and behaving as though he had left a kiss within the cup. And I think we should probably accept *ἀντᾶς ἐν* from Valckenaer.

It may be said that the actions of drinking and kissing are too dissimilar for the resemblance to be thus assumed. They did not seem dissimilar to Ben Jonson, or to the poet who wrote: 'The life of all mortals in kissing should pass, | Lip to lip while we're young—then the lip to the glass.' Ben Jonson was paraphrasing Philostratus (*Epist.* 33), who uses similar language elsewhere (32, 60), and the idea is almost a commonplace in later Greek erotic: *Anth. Pal.* V. 170, 260, 294, 304; XII. 133; Bion 1. 45 ff.; [Luc.] *Lucius* 8. I am not required by this view to establish that the verb *ἐρείδειν* could be used of kissing; but it is in fact so used at *Anth. Pal.* V. 254. II, and, if the aor. part. *ἐρίσας* is defensible, at V. 13. 3.

Theocr. 13. 23:

ἄλλὰ διεκάχε, βαθὺν δὲ εἰσέθραψε Φάσιν,
αἰερὸς ως μέγα λαῖτμα, ἀφ' οὗ τότε χοιράδες ἔσταν.

The meaning of *λαῖτμα* is discussed by lexicographers and by the scholiasts on *Od.* 7. 35 and *Ap. Rhod.* 1. 1299, but the discussions merely reveal their ignorance. In Homer, Hesiod, and the *Homeric Hymns* it occurs eleven times—twice with a simple demonstrative, else-

¹ The aor. *ἐφίληθεν* is paralleled by 15. 100, Ar. *Ran.* 229, both adduced by Cholmeley.

where always, as here, with *μέγα*, and usually also with a genitive—*άλος* or *θαλάσσης*. Apollonius has it in three places;¹ after him it perhaps disappears again until the fifth century A.D. The Homeric passages do not enable us to decide the precise meaning, but the frequency of its occurrence in contexts dealing with the perils of the sea suggests either breadth or depth as the idea connoted. Now in the strait of the Symplegades the depth of the water is immaterial, its lack of breadth notorious; and I cannot suppose that *λαῖτρα* is the object of *διεξάζεν*. Nor, if we translate 'as an eagle sweeps over the sea' (or the like), is the figure appropriate to the Argo squeezing between the rocks. These objections seem to me to compel us to connect the *μέγα λαῖτρα* with Phasis, and therefore to reject Jacobs' transposition of the second halves of the lines.² Lobeck (*Ajax*², p. 269), it is true, requires of me evidence that *λαῖτρα* could be used of a river by poets earlier than Nonnus, and I have none to give. But *λαῖτρα* is, outside Homer, a very rare word, and equally I know no evidence that justifies its use for a narrow strait; and, short of desperate remedies, one of these two it must be. For Phasis it may be said, too, that among the explanations of *λαῖτρα* given in antiquity are *χάσμα* and *βάθος*; and if that is what T. thought it meant, he might well have set *μέγα λαῖτρα* in apposition to *βαθὺν Φάσιν*. I should punctuate, therefore, with commas after *Φάσιν* and *ός*.

Theocr. 14. 43:

αἵνος θηρ λέγεται τις ἔβα καὶ τάῦρος δν' οὐλαρ.

So V Tr. The other MSS. and the scholia vary between *ἔβακεν τάῦρος* and *ἔβα κένταυρος*. 'Also passt *kai* vorzüglich,' says Wilamowitz (*Textg.*, p. 41²); ''auch der Stier ist in den Wald gegangen,' sagt man, wenn jemand auf Nimmerwiedersehen fort ist.' Perhaps; but Cynisca has not gone to the wood, and I do not feel *kai* to be in place myself. *κένταυρος* is out of court by reason of Soph. *O.T.* 476 ff., and the

evidence apparently points to *ἔβα κεντάῦρος*, which might perhaps be defended as potential—'may' or 'must have gone.' The treatment of this construction in the grammars is extremely confused,³ and the decisive examples are usually emended (*Od.* 4. 546; Soph. *Phil.* 572; Eur. *I.T.* 385; *Hel.* 587: see Professor Pearson's note on the last passage). Eur. *I.A.* 1582 seems, however, to show that it is Greek of a kind, and there is perhaps a quorum in more respectable writers. In any case *alvos* is, I think, 'fable' rather than proverb; and the second half of the line rather allusion than quotation: 'you know the old tale: the bull's in the wood by now.'

Theocr. 17. 53-7:

These lines have been so curiously misunderstood by Droysen (*Hellenismus* III. 1. 324¹), Legrand (*Etude*, p. 60), and Cholmeley, that it may be worth remarking that they are merely T.'s transition from Ptolemy Soter and his wife to Ptolemy Philadelphus. The meaning is, 'sons inherit their fathers' qualities', and it is plainly marked by the careful disposition of epithets—*λαοφόνον . . . ἀκοντιστάν . . . αἰχμητά, αἰχμητά*.

Theocr. 22. 60:

II. Εὐθοίς, καὶ ξενίων κε τυχών πάλιν οἰκαδ' Ικάρου.
Α. μήτε σύ με ξενίζε, τά τ' ἐξ ἐμεῦ οὐκ ἐτολμηρ.

Commentaries do not quote the precise parallel, Ar. *Vesp.* 652 B. *ἀτὰρ ωπάτερε ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη—Φ. παῖσαι καὶ μὴ πατέριζε.* *Mή με ξενίζε* surely means 'drop this talk of *ξένος* (54) and *ξενία*.' The idiom, like the dialogue in which it occurs and much else in 22, is unepic; and perhaps for that reason T. has so phrased it as to leave open the alternative, but much inferior, meaning 'never entertain me.'

Theocr. 26. 17:

πέτλως ἐκ ζωτῆρος ἐς τυνάν ερύσασαι.

'Girding their kirtles up above their thighs' (Edmonds), *ἐκ* being, no doubt, instrumental as at 2. 10, 7. 6; and so Vollgraff (*B.C.H.* XLVIII., p. 143).

¹ I. 1299, 4. 980, 1694; I. 1299 without adj. or gen.

² The hiatus at the weak caesura in 24 is defended by 7. 8, 22. 116, 24. 72.

³ Kühner-Gerth I. 212; Goodwin, *M.T.*, p. 82; Gildersleeve, *Synt. of Classical Gk.*, I. p. 170; F. E. Thompson, *Synt. of Attic Gk.*, p. 272.

What others think, they do not say; but I should have supposed the meaning to be, 'drawing their garments down from their belts,' far enough for decency, but not far enough to impede pursuit. The ancients are reticent about mysteries, but ceremonial exposure of the person is fairly well attested (J. Heckenbach, *de nuditate sacra*, pp. 61 ff.; A. B. Cook, *Zeus* II. 132²).

Theocr. *Epigr.* 18. 6.

'Koer, welche sich in Syrakus niedergelassen, hatten das Denkmal des Epicharmos, der auch von Geburt ein Koer gewesen sein soll, errichtet' (Fritzsche). Epicharmus's Coan origin has been disputed; but at any rate it is with the poet, whatever his origin, and not with the god to whom the statue is dedicated, that the dedicators claim fellow-citizenship. It seems necessary, therefore, to write ὁ Βάκχε χάλκεον νι . . . τὸν ὁδὸν άνέθηκαν . . . οἱ ἄνδρα πολίταν instead of the ἄνδρι πολίτα which stands in all texts I have consulted. *Mallēm in accusativo ut cum νιν in versu tertio cohaereant* said Wordsworth's note, but his text still associated the words with τελεῖν in v. 8; and, indeed, I suspect the dative to survive by a mere oversight from texts which left that association possible or even necessary.

Moschus 2. [*Europa*] 48:

δοιοῦ δὲ ξεσασαν ἴψοις ἐπ' ὄφροις αἰγαλοῖο
φῶτες δολλήσαν θησεῖντο δὲ ποντούροις βοῦν.

'Etsi Sophocles, *Trach.* 512, δολλεῖς de duobus dixit, ubi scholiastes id καταχρηστικῶς factum adnotavit, tamen nec per se veri simile est ut duo tantum spectatores ficti fuerint, nec, si duo, ut addiderit poeta δολλῆδην. Quare scripsi δοιοῦ ἐπ' ὄφρύσιν αἴγαλοῖο' (Hermann). Hermann's proposal has disappeared from modern texts of Moschus, and his two reasons for making it are perhaps not conclusive. It was in the main a third which led me to conjecture δοιοῦ independently.

Europa's golden *tálaros* is decorated with four scenes, two above and two below. Above are Hermes, and Argos with the peacock springing from his blood; below, Io in bovine form crossing the sea, and Io rehumanised by Zeus on the banks of the Nile. A

tálaros is shaped like a large truncated funnel, and the description suggests two bands of decoration, the upper with one figure, the lower with one scene, on each side of the vessel. I do not think the decoration can be so precisely analysed as that of the cup in Theocr. I, but one obvious question presents itself. In the lower zone, which occupies the shorter circumference of the vessel, are scenes which must take considerable space, for they include an expanse of sea and the river Nile. It is natural, therefore, to think of the scenes each occupying half the circumference, and, since they are somewhat indeterminate, to wonder how they are separated from each other.¹

If, however, we read δοιοῦ, we shall kill not only Hermann's two birds but this third also. The scene containing Io will then be flanked with the rising shores of Greece and Egypt respectively, each with its group of people; and the two groups, one on each side of the *tálaros*, will effectively separate the two scenes in this zone of the composition. Δοιός in the singular is not common, but has good Hellenistic authority: *Anth. Pal.* VI. 113 (*Simias*), VII. 89 (*Callimachus*), IX. 46 (*Antipater Mac.*). Hermann's ὄφρύσι is perhaps an improvement, but I do not think it strictly necessary.

Moschus 2. [*Europa*] 60.

The four lines 58-61 are in some confusion, and neither Wilamowitz's *ταρός* in 61 nor Platt's ἔξανταέλλων . . . ἀναπλώσας' (*J. Phil.* XXXIV. 150) seems to me quite satisfactory. Perhaps we should accept the feminine participle, but read *ταρσὰ δ'* in 60; the neuter plural is not known elsewhere before Oppian and the *Anacreontica*, but various similar forms appear first in Alexandrian literature: see Kühner-Blass I. 500.

[Moschus 3.] *Epit. Bion.* 37-49.

I need not write at length on this passage, since I find that what I was to propose stands already in Hermann's text. Read, with most MSS., δ' ἐπὶ for ποτὶ in 47, and replace the full stop at

¹ I cannot agree with Wilamowitz (*Textg.*, p. 228) that two men watching a cow crossing the sea, and Zeus stroking a cow, are well-balanced pendants.

the end of 44 by a comma.¹ The ἀδονίδες and χελιδόνες of 46 then stand in rational relation to the Ἀηδάν and Χελιδών of 38 f.; and at δ' in 48 means the mythological bird-men of 37-43. Hermann omits the refrain at 45, but unnecessarily. In both Theocritus' refrain-poems the refrain breaks the construction once and once only (1. 84, 2. 135).

[Moschus 4.] *Megara* 65.

'Why talk of these old sorrows?' says Alcmene. 'We are not likely to forget them, and we have wept for them before':

ἢ οὐχ ἄλις, οἰς ἔχόμεσθα τὸ δεύταρον αἱὲν ἐπ' ἡμαρ γνωμένους;

And she adds apparently, though the text is problematic,² that it is no

¹ Modern editors, except Legrand in the new Budé text, have similarly perverted the sense by punctuation at Theocr. 16. 46.

² I should accept provisionally 67 ἀριθμηθεῖσις (Wilamowitz), 68 θαρσοῖς (Hermann), 71 ἀγχαλῶν (Sitzler).

good summing misfortunes in a grand total.

The words in 65 must mean, I think, what Cholmeley implies: 'Are not those sorrows enough which afflict us in continual succession to the last day of our lives?' The required sense, however, is 'our present sorrows'; or, as Mr. Edmonds says, 'Are not the misfortunes which possess us enough each day as they come?' I do not see, however, what has become of τὸ δεύταρον in this version.

I think myself that τὸ δεύταρον is adverbial and belongs to ἔχόμεσθα; and I am tempted to guess that γνωμένους conceals an infinitive meaning 'to bewail'—e.g. κλαίειν: 'Is it not enough to bewail day by day the sorrows with which we are most recently afflicted?' Κλαίειν seems to be the verb indicated by the context, but I am not otherwise wedded to it, for γνωμένους may be a gloss due to someone who, like Mr. Cholmeley, construed τὸ δεύταρον with ἡμαρ.

A. S. F. Gow.

THE LYRA OF ORPHEUS.

PROFESSOR J. J. SAVAGE has recently drawn attention to a number of unpublished scholia on Virgil contained in Parisinus lat. 7930, and has brought to light from them one new fragment of Naevius, one of Sallust, and one of Varro.¹ The last deserves particular attention.

The note on *Aen.* VI. 119, after in effect reproducing what Servius says, adds: *dicunt tamen guidam liram Orphei cum VII cordis fuisse, et caelum habet VII zonas, unde theologia assignatur. Varro autem dicit librum Orfei de uocanda anima liram nominari, et negantur animae sine cithara posse ascendere.* 'Some people, however, say that the lyre of Orpheus had seven strings, and the sky has seven zones, and hence a theological explanation is given.'² But Varro says

that a book of Orpheus on the summoning of the soul is called *Lyra*, and it is denied that souls can ascend without a lyre.³ It is not likely that this note is a pure figment; the other new material quoted by Savage certainly looks genuine. We have in it a direct mention of an Orphic treatise *Λύρα*, which seems to be otherwise unknown, and a somewhat obscure reference to its contents.

The words *et . . . ascendere* need not be part of Varro's statement or directly concerned with the Orphic treatise in question; it is a habit of scholiasts to set side by side a medley of facts and fancies illustrative of their texts. The words in themselves are most naturally interpreted as referring to the soul's ascent after death through the seven planetary spheres. According to a widespread belief the soul came from heaven and returned to heaven. In its

¹ *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* LVI. (1925) 229 ff.

² Cf. Kern, *Orphica*, 143, No. 60, ἐν ταῖς φερομέναις ἥψιφοις Ὁρφικais ἡ θεολογία γέδε. Orpheus is repeatedly classed among *theologi poetae* in S. Aug. *Ciu. d.* XVIII., and Marius Plotius Sacerdos, *Art. gramm.* III. 3 (VI. 502, Keil), mentions that the hexameter was called *metrum theologicum* from its use by Orpheus

and Musaeus. *Vt caelum habet* is possible, but not necessary.

³ The distinction between *cithara* and *lyra* is here as commonly ignored.

earthward descent it gained a sin on passing each sphere: *cum descendunt animae, trahunt secum torporem Saturni, Martis iracundiam, libidinem Veneris, Mercurii lucri cupiditatem, Iouis regni desiderium.*¹ In its heavenward ascent it lost a sin at each sphere: *οὐτως ὄρμῃ λοιπὸν ἄνω ὁ ἀνθρώπος διὰ τῆς ἀρμονίας καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ζώνῃ δίδωσι τὴν αὐξητικὴν ἐνέργειαν κ.τ.λ.*² The lyre corresponds to the world order, its seven strings to the seven planets, each of which has its voice in the music of the spheres; the lyre's harmony is an imitation of the harmony of the spheres, music has a purifying effect, and the man who has no music in his soul cannot rise to heaven, for only like can comprehend like.³ These ideas, commonplaces of the Pythagorean revival and not confined to it, explain *et negantur animae sine cithara posse ascendere*, although *sine cithara* remains a little vague.⁴

Was the *Λύρα* concerned with this topic? To suppose that it was requires a forced interpretation of the phrase *de uocanda anima*. It is just possible that a Christian redactor, paraphrasing his source, used the phrase in the sense of 'God's summoning of the soul from the body,' though in such examples as *caelesti sorte uocatus* and *pro factis ad alta uocaris*⁵ the sense is made clear by the context. If, however, we bear in mind that the line of Virgil being explained

refers to the quest of Eurydice, we may think not of the soul's ascent to bliss but of 'the invoking or summoning (i.e. raising) of spirits,' which is a much easier sense to give the phrase. Orpheus entered Hell, *ἡμετέρη πίσυνος κιθάρη*, as he is made to say, *Arg.* 42, and raised Eurydice. This could be a prototype for spirit-raising, which was a common magical enterprise. The connexion between mythical and contemporary spirit-raising is emphasised by an enlarged version of part of the Homeric *nekyomanteia* given by Julius Africanus in his *Κεστοί*.⁶ Africanus pleasantly leaves it an open question whether Homer himself or the Pisistratidae deleted the additional verses. Such a work as this *Λύρα* might be composed in the Neopythagorean circles to which not a few of our later Orphica are with reason assigned. In them necromancy seems to have been practised; we may recall Cicero's taunt to Valerius: *tu qui te Pythagoreum soles dicere . . . cum inferorum animas elicere, cum puerorum extis deos manes mactare soleas?*⁷ That is the sense we want. *uocanda* will bear the meaning 'invoke' (cf. Seneca, *Oed.* 559, *uocat inde manes teque qui manes regis*, and the claim of Orpheus, *Arg.* 39, to have taught *λασμός τε θεῶν φθιμένων τ' ἐπινήχυτα δῶρα*), and may imply conjuration. It would, however, be preferable to read *euocanda*. *euoco* is a technical term in this sense, like *excio*, *elicio*, *excito*. *De euocanda anima* might render *περὶ ψυχαγογίας*.

Ascendere might also be interpreted of the ascent of souls when conjured. It seems, however, better to assume, as I have said, that the clause *et . . . ascendere* is independent of *Varro . . . nominari*, and it is possible that in an earlier version the note ran: '*unde teologia assignatur, et negantur animae sine cithara*

¹ Serv. *ad Aen.* VI. 714; cf. his note on XI. 50 and Arnob. II. 16, 28 (both perhaps drawing upon Labeo), and Macrobi. *In Somn. Scip.* I. 11. 12 (drawing on Numenius, according to Cumont, *Revue de philologie*, 1920, 231). On the idea in general cf. Boussac, *Arch. j. Rel.* XVIII. 145 ff.

² Corp. *Herm.* I. 25. The first zone is the Moon's. The qualities lost at the later spheres are sins.

³ For the voices of the planets cf. Cumont, *Rev. phil.* 1919, 78 ff.; for the cathartic power of music, A. Delatte, *Étude sur la littérature pythagoricienne*, 262 f.; for the lyre's harmony as an imitation of the harmony of the universe, Serv. *in Aen.* VI. 645 and Cumont, *Rev. arch.* 1918, 67. Hippolytus, *Ref.* IV. 48. 2, p. 70. 20 Wendland remarks that the constellation *Lyra* has seven strings signifying the whole harmony of the universe.

⁴ A possible parallel is the representation in the stuccos of the apse of the Basilica near the Porta Maggiore of Sappho holding a lyre as a type of the blessed soul (cf. now J. Carcopino, *Études Romaines*, I. 372 ff.).

⁵ Diehl, *Inscr. chr. lat.* 1644, 3359.

⁶ P. Oxy. 412. Cf. on it Th. Hopfner, *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungsauber*, II. 150 ff., §§ 334 ff.; Hopfner gives a full treatment of the whole subject.

⁷ In *Vatinium* 14 (*cum* means 'though' in reference to words here omitted). For Varro's interest in thaumaturgy cf. Apul. *Apol.* 42 (his record of a prophecy about the result of the Mithridatic war made by a boy of Tralles who looked at a reflection of a Hermes in water).

*posse ascendere; Varro autem dicit librum
Orfei de uocanda anima liram nominari.'*

In any case we have to thank Professor Savage for the name of a new Orphic treatise and for a *terminus ad quem* for it in the citation by Varro.

In which of his works it occurred, whether in his religious writings or in one of the Menippean satires, the Περὶ ἔξαγωγῆς (which probably included a Nekyia) or the Ὁνος λύρας, we cannot say.

A. D. NOCK.

CICERO, PRO SESTIO VIII. 18, AND THE 'COLUMNA RHEGIA.'

'PUTEALI et faeneratorum gregibus inflatus, a quibus compulsus olim, ne in Scyllaeo illo aeris alieni tamquam [in] fretu ad Columnam adhaeresceret, in tribunatus portum perfugerat, contemnebat equites Romanos, minitabatur senatus' (*Pro Sestio VIII.*, § 18).

Thus Cicero describes Gabinius and 'the usurers under pressure from whom he had taken refuge in the haven of the tribuneship in order in that Scyllan strait of debt to avoid clinging (or "sticking") to the Column.' The current explanation of the clause italicised is given by Holden: 'ad Columnam: sc. Maeniam, which was the tribunal of the triumviri capitales for the trial of the lowest malefactors. There is also an allusion to the columna in the *fretum Siculum*, called here *Scyllaeum fretum*, which the inhabitants of Rhegium had erected . . . adhaeresceret: in a double sense for naufragium faceret and proscriberetur. Stripped of metaphor, the whole passage would have run thus: ne aere alieno obrutus ad columnam Maeniam proscriberetur. Translate: "for fear he should stick fast on the pillar (i.e. be posted as a defaulter on the Maenian column) in that dangerous whirlpool of debt." Now, whatever the real perils, they are undoubtedly conceived here under the form of an adventure by sea; but *adhaeresco* does not elsewhere have the sense of *naufragium facere*, nor would shipwreck in the Straits of Messina naturally be described as *ad Columnam* (i.e. τὴν τῶν Πρήσιν στυλίδα) *adhaerescere*. The *Columna* was on shore. I would suggest that there is another element in Cicero's thought, and that he said 'Scyllaeo fretu' and not 'Siculo fretu' with a purpose, meaning more than a reference to the familiar straits. Scylla was popularly and originally associated with one story almost uniquely—that

of Odysseus—allusion to which, therefore, would naturally be understood by Romans of education. Cicero was speaking to a jury of senators, knights, and *tribuni aerarii*,¹ who later in the speech understood allusive references to the sacrifice of the daughters of Erechtheus² and the fate of Miltiades.³

Through the perilous strait betwixt the rocks Odysseus first sails on the side of Scylla, but after his ship is destroyed he is swept back thither, this time towards the other rock. The latter, however, has a feature of which Circe forewarned him:

τῷ δὲ ἐν ἐρυεός ἐστι μέγας, φόλλουσι τεθηλώς.
τῷ δὲ ὑπὸ δια Χάροβδις ἀνέρροιβδεῖ μέλαν θόωρ.
Od. XII. 103 f.

When, therefore, he is carried thither,

ἡ μὲν ἀνέρροιβδης θαλάσσης ἀλμυρὸς θόωρ.
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ ποτὶ μακρὸν ἐρυεός ὑπόστιος ἀρέσις
τῷ προσφύτῃ ἐχόμην ὡς νυκτερίς· οὐδέ τη εἶχο
οὔτε στρηγάς ποτὲ ἐμπέδον οὐτὲ ἐπιβῆμαι·
όλιμος γάρ ἔκας εἶχον, ἀπήκοι δὲ ἐσαν δῖοι.

Ibid. 431 ff.

He clings to the trunk, naked and column-like, betwixt root and branches, '*adhaerescit ad columnam*.' Cicero uses *adhaeresco* in almost the same image elsewhere: 'ad quamcumque sunt disciplinam quasi tempestate delati, ad eam tamquam ad saxum adhaerescunt' (*Ac. II. 3.8; cf. De Fin. V. 18. 49*). This, I suggest, was his play of thought, not only to compare the perilous straits of Gabinius to the Scyllan Straits, but, taking advantage of the coincidence, to liken the perils of emerging from the first by facing prosecution and being posted upon the Columna Maenia to those of emerging from the second by way of the naked tree-trunk.

What, however, of the *στυλίς* near Rhegium, the 'columna Rhegia,' which has passed muster merely as a pillar

¹ In accordance with the *lex Aurelia iudicaria* of Cotta.

² XXI, § 48.

³ LXVII., § 141.

for some reason sacred to Poseidon, the god of the sea? If we look at the map and at the location of Scylla and Charybdis by the later Greeks, we see that Scylla was recognised at the northern end of the strait and Charybdis several miles to the south, near the Sicilian coast, opposite, not to Rhegium itself, but to the *στυλίς* or *Columna* (see e.g. Strabo, pp. 256, 268, and 171). The usual meanings of *στυλίς* are 'pillar, post, or mast'; and it is perhaps worth suggesting that this erection (of a kind rare elsewhere) just at this point formed not only a convenient middle term for Cicero's thought, but originally also, being a pillar of wood (*i.e.* a tree-trunk) or stone, perhaps with foliated capital,¹ was set up in

¹ *πυργίον τι*, apparently applied to the *στυλίς* by Strabo, suggests a *columna cochlis*, some-

part to commemorate the huge fig-tree of Homer's story at the point where safety from Charybdis might be sought² —it was the regular point of landing—and was associated with the name of the rescuing sea-god, on whom men might call for deliverance from his daughter³ Charybdis as they called on Crataeis for deliverance from her daughter Scylla (*Od.* XII. 124 f.). He was strong to deliver, but when Charybdis was swallowing

οὐ . . . κεν πύργα σ' ὑπὲκ κακοῦ οὐδέ ἐνσίχθων.
Od. XII. 107.

R. B. ONIANS.

thing resembling on a smaller scale Trajan's column or Hardy's 'tower in the form of a classical column' (*Two on a Tower*, init.).

² It was, however, on the Italian shore.

³ This relationship (see Servius *ad Aen.* III. 420) does not appear in Homer.

ON THE TEXT AND INTERPRETATION OF HORACE, S. II. 1. 85 F.

'Si mala considerit in quem quis carmina, ius
est
iudiciumque.' 'Esto, si quis mala; sed bona
si quis
iudice considerit laudatus Caesare? si quis
opprobriis dignum latraverit integer?' . . .
ipsae
solventur risu Tabulae, tu missus abibis.'
85
. . . latraverit integer ipse? solventur risu
tabulae, etc., codd. plerique et edd.

It is strange that in this *locus vexatus* a variant so important as *ipsae*, the reading of the tenth century Paris MSS. φ and ψ, is not even mentioned in the standard texts and commentaries. Yet as it is commonly printed the passage is disfigured by a superfluity and a defect. 'Ipse' is at best *de trop*,¹ while the word 'tabulae' cries out to be emphasised, not only by the capital letter which Wickham gives it in his translation, but also by the pronoun 'ipsae' assigned to it, we may well believe, by Horace, and preserved both in the two 'testes integerrimi' of

¹ For the use of the qualifying adjective 'integer,' cp. Cicero's 'nemo fere saltat sobrius,' and Horace, S. II. 3. 5, 188, 197, 281; 4. 5; *Epp.* I. 2. 34, etc.

The best comment on 'latraverit' is furnished by Cicero, *Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* 56-57, which even Palmer fails to cite: for the accusative see, e.g. *Epoche* 5. 57 f.

the β family above-mentioned, and, as an alternative, in the commentary of Acron: 'aut subsellia solventur aut ipsae leges.' The Twelve Tables, if not actually quoted *in extenso*, are at any rate definitely referred to by Trebatius in lines 80 f. After that it is perfectly natural to go a step further, and personify them—a High Court of Appeal—in line 86, as Cicero (*Pro Milone* 9; cf. also 11) personifies them—he, too, with the addition of the pronoun, 'cum videant gladium ab ipsis porrigi Legibus'; and as Plato before him had personified the Laws of Athens in the *Crito* (XI. 50). Neglect of the initial capital was bound to cause trouble, as it did for so long in the *Silvae* of Statius (V. 2. 152); as it does still (a) in Virgil, *Aen.* VII. 766, where for 'poenas' read 'Poenas,' and cp. *Iliad* IX. 454 with Leaf's note *ad loc.*, and Cicero, *Pro Cuentio*, § 171, '. . . a socrus, ab uxorum, a fratri, a liberum Poenis actum esse praecipitem in sceleratorum sedem ac regionem'; and

(b) In Ovid, *Met.* VI. 538, where—pace the editors—the manuscript text is sound enough: all that is needed is the emendation 'Poena' (as in Horace, C. IV. 5. 24 and III. 2. 32) for 'poena':

, tu geminus coniunx, hostis mihi debita Poena
est.¹

Additional emphasis is gained by placing the pronoun at the end of the line. So Ovid (*Met.* XV. 127) :

'nec satis est quod tale nefas committitur; ipsos
inscripsere deos sceleri.'

Professor Garrod, in his preface to the revised Wickham in the S.C.B.O., calls attention to the fact that time and again, when the α family fails us, MSS. of the β family come to the rescue. We have only to listen to two of its members here to be quit of all these doubts and difficulties, which would never have beset the texts and commentaries, had the editors turned up their Keller and Holder, and sought help where help was to be found—viz. in ϕ and ψ , with Acron behind them. Even without that help Schütz, as reported by Palmer, interprets aright the general sense of the two lines. But to bring out their meaning and their bearing fully, some further discussion and elucidation is required.

* * * * *

In this prologue or epilogue—call it which you will—Horace is giving us his last word on satire, and stressing once for all the fundamental difference between his own method and the method of his master Lucilius. That difference hinges on the preference of Lucilius for $\tau\delta\psi\omega\rho\pi\omega$ and of Horace for $\tau\delta\gamma\lambda\omega\omega$. Horace had made the point already both at the beginning and at the end of his first book, in which the 'ridentem dicere verum quid vetat?' of I. 23 f. is taken up and emphasised by the 'ridiculum acri fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res' of II. 14, a sentence on which the whole passage, of which it is the centre-piece, depends.² This question ('ridiculum' versus 'acre') is in effect the vital issue on which Horace has gone to his lawyer Trebatius for advice. 'Quid faciam, praescribe.' To end effectively, the satire

¹ For the collocation of words, cp. 'di me terrent et Iuppiter hostis,' *Aen.* XII. 895; and for the feminine 'hostis,' Ovid, *A.A.* II. 461, and *Her.* VI. 82.

² Obviously the words 'bona (carmina)' in the passage before us (II. I. 83) constitute an epitome of the stylistic qualities dealt with in full at I. 10. 7 ff.

should end by giving us the final ruling of the specialist consulted; and given that ruling is, in terms of a hyperbole.³ As in a somewhat similar context Plato (*R.P.* 487A) invokes the Genius of criticism—οὐδέ ἀν ὁ Μῶμος τό γε τοιοῦτον μέμφαστο—so Trebatius, after preparing the way for his quip by a definite reference in line 83 to the *ipsissima verba* of the XII Tabulae,⁴ the 'fons omnis publici privatique iuris,' cites for judges to pronounce sentence, and to laugh the case out of court, the XII Tabulae themselves, as embodying to a legal mind the Genius of law. In view of the legal colour given to the whole piece by making a lawyer one of the *dramatis personae*, no charge of ambiguity can lie against the writer; unless we deliberately rob the word 'risu(s)' of its proper force by forgetting or ignoring the fact that 'risus,' good-tempered and infectious mirth, is the key-word to Horace's theory of satire: 'Omne vafer vitium *ridenti* Flaccus amico tangit et admissus circum præcordia ludit.'

'Solvore,' as in Martial (IX. 28. 4), '... qui spectatorem potui fecisse Catonem, solvere qui Curios Fabriciosque graves,' is, I take it, used metaphorically in the sense of 'to melt,' 'to dissolve,'⁵ a

³ As Horace makes the XII Tables laugh, so Lucretius makes his atoms laugh, I. 919 f. and II. 976 ff.

⁴ Cp. *Epp.* II. I. 23 f. and 152 ff., 'Tabulas peccare vetantis quas bis quinque viri sanxere,' etc.; and see Wordsworth, *Fragments and Specimens of E.L.*, pp. 259 f., with Palmer's comment on our passage.

⁵ So, in the literal sense, at C. I. 4. 1 and 10; 9. 5: 'Solvitur acris hiems grata vice,' etc. Cp. the metaphorical use of 'regelare' in Seneca and Martial, whose 'rigidi Catones' (X. 20 [19] 21) are the analogue of Horace's 'rigidus Niphates' (C. II. 9. 20). But with a word like 'solvore' it is dangerous to dogmatise. Thus a comparison of Virgil's usage in such passages as *Aen.* I. 92; XII. 951 and 867, 'illi membra novus solvit formidine torpor' (see also perhaps *ib.* IV. 55, IX. 236, and X. 305, 'solvitur,' 'breaks up,' 'goes to pieces' of a ship), suggests that here as elsewhere 'solvore' stands for the Greek *λύειν*, and means simply 'unstring' (*λύει δὲ γύια*), 'overcome,' 'put out of action'—a metaphor almost equally apt and effective. The ablative is presumably not modal, but instrumental, as in Seneca, *Epp.* 78. 18, 'non vincetur dolor ratione, qui victus est risu'; cf. the Homeric *γέλω* *τεκθανον* of *Odyssey* XVIII. 100.

figure of speech for which Trebatius has prepared the way by his 'maiorum ne quis amicus frigore te feriat' in lines 61 f. above. We might illustrate the expression from the idiom of to-day by 'Mr. Max Beerbohm's dictum that there is something dreary in the notion of going anywhere for the specific purpose of being amused. I prefer that laughter shall take me unawares. Only so can it master and dissolve me.'¹

'We have in this world,' says Meredith, 'men whom Rabelais would call

¹ 'H. B.' in the *Sunday Times*, July 10, 1927; see also Mr. Kipling's *Rewards and Fairies*, p. 77.

agelasts; that is to say non-laughers, men who are in that respect as dead bodies, which if you prick them do not bleed.' The *Tabulae* are 'agelasts.' That is the point. 'Mirth such as yours,' says Trebatius, 'will take even Law incarnate unawares, and make the non-laughing laugh with the best.'

Last, there is something thoroughly Horatian about the antithesis ('solventur-risu Tabulae'), which for climax gathers up the two elements in the *Satire*, Literature and Law, in a juxtaposition similar to the famous 'Troica quem peperit sacerdos' of C. III. 3. 32.

D. A. SLATER.

LATIN HINNULEUS, HINULUS (?), 'FAWN.'

THE meaning, if not the spelling, of *hinnuleus* at Horace, *Carm.* I. 23. 1—

uitas hinnuleo me similis, Chloe,
quaerenti pauidam montibus aulis
matrem, non sine uano
aurarum et siluae metu

cannot be doubted; 'mule-foal' is not only inept, it is condemned by comparison with the fragment of Anacreon (Bergk 51) cited by all the commentators:

ἀγανῶς οἴλα τε νεθρὸν νεοθῆλέα
γαλαθηνύν, ὅστ' ἐν Δῆλῃ κερούσσης
ἀπολειφθεῖς ὑπὸ μητρὸς ἐπτομθῆ.

Notoriously the Romans were themselves erratic spellers whenever it was a question whether or not to write *h*, and the evidence of the MSS. is not always decisive to determine ancient practice, much less the etymological spelling. But however shaky in spelling, they knew, and certainly the poet knew, the difference between a fawn and a mule-foal. This, however, did not prevent them from using the same word to describe two so different creatures, and that they did so is not in itself surprising. Latin *tēla* may be either 'javelins' or 'a loom'; the context decides the meaning, as it does between the alternative renderings of *hinnuleus*, 'fawn' and 'mule-foal.' Similar pairs of homophones may be found in any language. The difficulty arises, in the case of *hinnuleus*, simply because two words originally as distinct in pronunciation as in meaning, neither of

them very familiar, came to be pronounced, first almost and then entirely alike.

hinnus, which was borrowed from Greek *ἱννός* and then took an initial *h* by association with *hinnire*, is 'mule' (Varro, *R.R.* 2. 8. 1), and its diminutive *hinnulus*, 'mule-foal' (Pliny, *N.H.* 8. 172), of which the derivative *hinnuleus*, properly an adjective (as at Scribonius 13), was also used, by a common development, as a noun identical in meaning (Varro, *L.L.* 9. 28; Pliny, *N.H.* 8. 118). But beside this group of words stood **enelos*, cognate with Greek *ἐνέλος* and Armenian *ul* (see Walde, *Lat. Etym. Wtb.*, ed. 2, s.v. *hin(n)uleus*), of which the normal Latin development would have been **enulus* and its adjective **enuleus*. Not only the initial *h*- and the 'doubled' *n* must be due to confusion with *hinnulus*, 'mule-foal,' but also (what has not been previously recognised) the change of *e* (in an accented syllable) to *i* under conditions in which *ɛ* was otherwise preserved (e.g., *genus*, *penus*, *tenus*). The explanation proposed by Stoltz, *Hist. Gram.* I. (1894), p. 135, fails, since in *sigillum*, *tigillum* we have *i* for *ɛ* before *-nl-* in a syllable which in Old Latin was unaccented.

Now since the confusion was so complete, the spelling (*h*)*hinnuleus* is preferable; for variation between *-n-* and *-nn-* is a matter upon which manuscript evidence, conflicting as it is, cannot be accepted at its face value. In Horace, at least, the *inuleo* of the good MSS. is

ughers,
s dead
do not
elasts.
uch as
e even
ake the
'

roughly
solven-
climax
in the
juxta-
Troica
. 3. 32.
TER.

be pro-
entirely

1 from
initial *h-*
'mule'
inutive
(8. 172),
properly
(3), was
ment, as
tro, *L.L.*
at beside
*enebos,
menian
, ed. 2,
normal
e been
s. Not
doubled' *n*
innulus,
ot been
age of *e*
under
herwise
(). The
Hist.
since in
before
Latin

so com-
prefer-
and *-nn-*
uscript
not be
Horace,
MSS. is

unmetrical, for *i-* is without authority, and the length of the *syllable* (as distinguished from that of the *vowel*) is better indicated, as in *Porsenna* beside *Porsena*, by the prolonged (or so-called 'doubled') *n*. The question of the spelling with or without initial *h-* is of less importance; the ancients themselves were not sure about it, and even in *hinnus* the *h-* requires explanation. It is, however, the fact that wherever *hinnuleus* means 'fawn' the MSS. show greater variation in respect of the initial *h-* than where it means 'mule-foal.' To make this distinction, however, between *innuleus* and *hinnuleus* in modern texts and dictionaries is to make a

distinction which the Romans did not make, as well as to obscure the history of *hinnuleus* 'fawn.' The form *henulus* given by a manuscript of Isidore, *Etym.* (Vallicelli A 18, at 12. 4. 44, see *Bull. du Cange*, 1925-26, p. 149), is merely one of many freakish spellings in the same MS.

But it would not be at all astonishing if Latin had a 'doublet' *hinulus* (with *z*), 'fawn,' which the history of the word would fully lead us to expect. It may be left to editors of Propertius to decide whether or not to accept this 'doublet' at Prop. 3. 13. 35, where the MSS. have 'atque hinuli pellis totos operibat amantes.'

J. WHATMOUGH.

SOPHOCLES *O.T.* 1511-1514.

σφῶν δ, ὁ τέκνος, εἰ μὲν εἰχέτην ἡδὺ φρένας,
πόλλα ἀνταργόνον· νῦν δὲ τοῦτο εὐχεσθέ μοι,
οὐ καρός, αἱρέ ζῆν, βίον δὲ λόγονος
ὑμᾶς κυρῆσαι τῷ φυτεύσαντος πατρός.
τούτῳ βίον codd.

I BELIEVE the text to be sound, as printed above, although that is not the general opinion. Let us see, then, if a paraphrase will be of assistance in enabling us to clear up the issues.

To you, my daughters, had ye by now reached the age of discretion, my advice would have been ample and to spare. But, as things are, such would I have your prayers, that while living where you can (where occasion offers) you may at least live more happily than the father who begat you.

What is amiss here? The difficulty which Mr. Moore feels (*C.R.* XLI. 57) is obviated when we remember that the clause *οὐδὲ . . . ζῆν* is actually subordinate and of secondary importance, and that the chief stress is attached to *βίον λόγονος κυρῆσαι*. I should like to refer in this connexion to Kuehner-Gerth. II. 261, 264. Instances like the present, where the second member is stressed, are common enough. Cf. *At.* 504, καὶ μὲν δαιμὼν ἔλα, οὐδὲ ἀισχρὰ τάπη ταύτα
καὶ τῷ σῷ γίνει, i.e., whatever my fortune may be, where τάπη ταύτα are the taunts to be levelled against Eurysaces and herself. *O.C.* 1536 θεοὶ^ν εὐ μὲν, οὐδὲ δὲ εἰσορώσ' ὅταν κ.τ.λ.

So far Jebb is excellent, but less so when he defends the admission of the article: 'τὸν before *βίον*, though not required, is commended by Greek idiom; and it is not likely to have crept into the text, since the occurrence of *αἱρέ* with the long was not so uncommon that it should have suggested the need of supplementing the metre by *τὸν*'. The answer to this is simple: *viz.*, that the intrusion of the article without any obvious reason—other than paedagogic—frequently occurs. Triclinius was a notorious sinner, and for examples see Starkie's note on *Acharnians*, p. lxxx.

A. C. PEARSON.

CICERO, *ORATOR*, 132.

'DICEREM perfectum, si ita iudicarem, nec in
ueritate crimen arrogantiae pertimescerem.'

Such is the form of the text in Friedrich's Teubner edition. But Sandys (Cambridge, 1885), followed by Wilkins (Oxonii, 1903), reads *extimescerem*. The oldest manuscript, the mutilated codex of Avranches (A 238, saec. IX.: formerly of Mont St. Michel), gives *pertimescerem*, all other examined manuscripts *extimescerem*. Why Sandys and Wilkins prefer the latter reading they do not say. Both *extimesco* and *pertimesco* are good Ciceronian words, and they may have preferred the former as the rarer word, and less likely to be altered than the other, or as the more difficult reading, seeing that it creates a hiatus avoided by the other. What I wish to point out is that there is evidence four centuries older than the Avranches MS. for the reading *pertimescerem*. Augustine (who was well acquainted with the writings of Cicero, as well as those of Virgil and Lucan), in his *In Iohannis Euangelium Tractatus CXXIV.*, No. 58, § 3, composed about A.D. 416, has occasion to quote the above words 'cuiusdam saecularis auctoris,' and he does so with the reading *pertimescerem*.

A. SOUTER.

TACITUS, *AGRICOLA*, XXVIII. 2.

TAC. *Agric.* XXVIII. 2: 'et uno remigante, suspectis duobus eoque interfectis,' etc. (F); 'uno renavigante' (H); 'uno regente' (Döderlein); 'uno <regente> remigante <s>' (W. R. Paton); 'una remigantes' et aliter alii: (v. Anderson in revised ed. of Furneaux, 1922, ad loc.).

The crux, of course, is that 'remigante' would not be said of a 'governator.' The sense is certain, as far as such things can be so: two of the three helmsmen have been slain, and the third is carrying on. Hence 'una remigantes,' though an easy correction ('s' lost owing to the first letter of 'suspectis'), is ruled out as excluding all mention of the third pilot, rendered imperative by 'suspectis duobus eoque interfectis,' an explanatory clause accounting for his being the

only one left. 'Uno renavigante' of H appears to me to be meaningless. Back whither? 'Uno regente' of Döderlein gives the sense, while Paton's emendation is even more ingenious, but the former does not really account for 'remigante,' and the latter is so far from the MSS. as to be extremely problematical, in addition to entailing a cacophony which Tacitus but rarely allows himself.

I would suggest 'uno rem agente,' which is palaeographically easy, and gives the meaning, 'rem agere' being used in its common sense of 'doing his job,' 'carrying on' with the action before mentioned ('gubernare'). The objection that none of the three pilots was surviving eventually, since the ships were lost at last

through lack of the helmsman's skill, does not seem to me to the point here, as, even if that is a correct inference from 'amisis per inscitiam regendi navibus,' there were numerous occasions and contingencies in the considerable interval that elapsed which might have accounted for the third man's disappearance. Thus would not an enemy have been selected to precede the 'infirmissimos suorum, mox sorte ductos' destined to play an involuntary part in the commissariat ('vescerentur')? Briefly, then, the gist of the matter is that the two helmsmen were suspected and slain, and the third carried on for the present, this being, in the existing state of the MSS., most probably expressed by 'rem agente.'

J. H. ILIFFE.

REVIEWS

THE RETURN OF ODYSSEUS.

Die Heimkehr des Odysseus: Neue homerische Untersuchungen. Von ULRICH VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF. Pp. viii + 205. Berlin: Weidmann, 1927. M. 8.40; bound, M. 10.

THIS book, like its predecessor from the same pen, *Die Ilias u. Homer*, is on no higher level than the multitude of Homeric treatises that were produced in Germany last century, and are now largely discredited in that country itself. It is quite old-fashioned, and comes too late to have any effect in reviving Kirchhoffism.

Three statements in it claim special mention. (1) Only 'idiots' believe in a Homer who composed the two epics (p. 172). (2) Anyone who would impugn the basis established by Kirchhoff for study of the *Odyssey* is 'impervious to scientific logic,' and deserves only silent contempt (p. i). This recalls the taunt the author once uttered against Blass. (3) The authors of certain Homeric works, which von Wilamowitz does not condescend to read—doubtless they are by some of the idiots above referred to—are requested to refrain in turn from reading the present volume (p. vi). This again recalls a query of Dr. Maret's in another connexion, 'what could be more stupefying than to shut yourself up in a closet and swallow your own gas?'

The senseless arrogance of these outbursts really absolves one from the necessity of taking the work seriously, and a perusal—a few pages

will suffice—can be recommended only on the ground that it will show that the treatment of the epic is exactly that which was in vogue in Germany in the worst days of last century. The late Dr. Leaf, who once upon a time favoured that treatment, rubbed his eyes when he read *Die Ilias u. Homer*, and deplored its adherence to old critical methods. He could have had no higher opinion, had he lived, of the present work. Space does not suffice for an examination of the criticism in detail, but one point may be noticed. There is the old, and to those who have studied them and considered them in other literatures, the scandalous misuse of the Repetitions. Rothe's *Wiederholungen* checked the flow of treatises on the subject in Germany, and the viciousness of the application of the expedient has often been exposed, but it is so fruitful of results if one is sufficiently audacious, that the temptation to profit by it is to some irresistible. 'The *viva sectio*,' as Coleridge said, 'is its own delight'; but this simple means of dissection adds greatly to the pleasure.

For the rest, the Telemachy is still a Telemachy and ω is late, and so on. In regard to ω , the latest of all the books, it was asked some years ago how it comes about that *F* and $\dot{\omega} \eta \tau o$ are as healthy in it as in the very earliest, *A*, but no answer has been given. And this suggests a more general question—will not some one of those who cut up and rearrange the *Odyssey* so confidently

oes not that is
scitiam
occasions
interval
ated for
ould not
ede the
os' des-
in the
hen, the
en were
d on for
state of
y 'rem
IFFE.

complete his task by showing how differences of the language of the various elements of vastly different ages confirm his reconstruction?

The title of the book, it should be noted, is exactly the same as that of the recent work on the *Odyssey* by Dörpfeld and Rüter.

A. SHEWAN.

MONOLOGUE AND SOLILOQUY.

Monolog und Selbstgespräch: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte der griechischen Tragödie. By WOLFGANG SCHADEWALDT. Pp. 270. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1926.

Tέτλαθι δή, κραδίν, says Odysseus, and it is no rare thing for an Homeric hero even in the stress of battle, after some ejaculation, generally of self-pity or appeal or protest to a god, to 'commune with his own great heart' in a set speech. The thing is done so naturally and so often that it seemed to Leo, in his well-known essay on 'The Monologue in Drama' (*Abh. Gött. Ges.*, 1908), that the Greeks, at any rate the old Ionians, must have had the habit in real life of talking to themselves and to the gods in times of crisis. Leo, as Mr. Schadewaldt observes, was justly indignant at the Ibsenitish heresy which banned soliloquy as 'artificial' and impoverished the modern stage; yet in Tragedy the evolution of the form was remarkably slow, and even after Sophocles, in the last speech of Ajax, and Euripides, in Medea's grim debate with her conflicting passions, had revealed its possibilities, the form was not exploited as it was, for instance, by our own Elizabethans, but first starved and then discarded in the later plays of the tragedians. In the New Comedy, of course, the 'monologue' became a regular and very useful technical device. Leo explained the matter simply. Tragedy never learnt to dispense with the chorus, and in the presence of a chorus no one can indulge in free soliloquy.

To Leo's essay Mr. Schadewaldt acknowledges his debt, and pays the tribute of a serious criticism. Devoted as he was to the New Comedy and thinking of the forms and functions of the comic monologue as normal, Leo did less than justice to the tragedians. He approached them not so much as masters of their own art, but as prede-

cessors of the comic artists, experimenters, endeavouring, not entirely without success, to hammer out a form analogous to those of later Comedy, but hampered by their own tradition and convention, in particular, as we have seen, by the embarrassing and ever-present chorus. Mr. Schadewaldt, who thinks of them as masters, not as slaves, of their convention, shows that, although the presence of a chorus naturally made a difference, it was, in this matter of soliloquy, by no means the decisive factor. Leo's conception of the technical 'monologue,' as a speech delivered without other persons present, led him to class together scenes which are in effect very different from one another—prologues, for example—and also to ignore or underestimate much which, though sung or spoken in the presence of a chorus or of other actors, has in fact the character of soliloquy. Schadewaldt thinks of the 'monologue,' not as a preconceived form to which the evolution had to tend, but as a natural method of dramatic expression, which springs to life whenever, under stress of strong emotion or of overpowering thought, the actor, whether or not he is physically solitary, draws into himself from his environment and feels and talks as if he were alone. By a new and thorough examination of the tragic material, he succeeds not only in showing the inadequacy of Leo's sketch, but in throwing new light on the methods of the dramatists. In particular his account of the process by which Euripides drew away from the vivid and passionate soliloquy form revealed in the *Medea* is an important contribution to dramatic history, and, indirectly, a by no means negligible advance in the direction of a sound solution of that very difficult and subtle problem, the history of the opinions of Euripides himself.

It is impossible in a short review to

discuss the many topics on which Mr. Schadewaldt's work is suggestive. On some, if space permitted, we should have to join issue with him. He seems, for instance, too much under the spell of T. von Wilamowitz's remarkable essay on Sophocles, a valuable protest against criticising stage-stuff in the spirit of a lawyer or historian or novelist, which went too far, however, in the direction of denying that the persons of ancient Tragedy were conceived as 'characters'—that is, as complete and living personalities—at all. Also his conscientious method leads to many repetitions and to wearisome insistence on points which should be obvious to anyone who apprehends the general drift of his argument. Lastly, he tends to use a philosophic jargon, vaguely impressive, and fashionable now in German criticism, but somewhat baffling to an uninitiated foreigner. Still the reward is worth the pains. Mr. Schadewaldt is a good scholar and a clear thinker. He knows his text, and, if his

solemn journey through scene after scene is not exactly thrilling, it is at any rate a sure and steady progress. Above all, he knows that plays are plays, and so avoids the pitfall into which, in spite of prefatory assurances to the contrary, most writers on Euripides have stumbled. He hardly ever uses an isolated speech or fragment without due analysis of context and dramatic situation as evidence for what the poet meant. That, in a writer about ancient drama, is a merit indispensable, and yet surprisingly rare.

The book is full of good things—an admirable comparison and contrast, for example, of the method of Aeschylus in the *Supplices* with his developed technique in the *Oresteia* (see especially p. 43), and a brilliant summary of the later, formalising tendencies of Euripides (p. 105 f.). But enough has, I hope, been said to indicate that, in my judgment, no serious student of Greek Tragedy should ignore this work.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

OUR DEBT TO AESCHYLUS, SOPHOCLES, LUCIAN.

(1) *Aeschylus and Sophocles: Their Work and Influence.* By J. T. SHEPPARD, M.A., Litt.D. Pp. 204. (2) *Lucian: Satirist and Artist.* By FRANCIS G. ALLINSON, Litt.D. Pp. 204. London, Calcutta, Sydney: G. G. Harrap and Co. 5s. each.

THE first thought of anyone who has read Dr. Sheppard's book must be the wish that he had been allowed to deal in two volumes with these authors. There is so much to say, and so little space to say it in, though Dr. Sheppard has ably carried out the work of compression. The first half of the book is devoted to the work of the two poets and their influence in classical times; the second gives an interesting summary of their influence in modern Europe from the end of the fourteenth century down to Wagner and Thomas Hardy. In dealing with Aeschylus the author has done well in paying special attention to one play, the *Agamemnon*, and revealing the nature of its dramatic texture; of the Sophoclean plays the *Ajax* has been given most attention,

but the *Electra* and *Trachiniae* are also carefully analysed, and special points in the remaining four are brought out. A few statements of Dr. Sheppard may seem questionable. On page 20 we are told that a woman's voice is heard crying 'Hallelujah' after the Watchman's speech; but the only recorded cry is the Watchman's own *iov*. On page 71 we read that Jocasta tries to prevent Oedipus 'from sending for the one eyewitness. But his insistence cannot be resisted. She yields.' But this is at line 861: it is only after this and the revelation of the Corinthian messenger that she is frightened at the prospect of his coming, not as eyewitness of the murder of Laius, but as recipient of the exposed babe. She had previously wondered at Oedipus' eagerness to see him (lines 766, 838), and said that he would be bound to corroborate his former statement (line 849), but she had not tried to prevent Oedipus sending for him. On page 136, the Eumenides is a mistake for the Libation-Bearers, where Orestes' nurse is spoken of.

In the second part of the book, no chapter is of greater interest than that on Milton, where Dr. Sheppard shows the influence of the great tragedians, not only on the dramatic form of the *Samson Agonistes*, but on the technique of the speeches, discovering in the balance of the thought the same kind of pattern which he had demonstrated in the Watchman's speech in the *Agamemnon*.

Dr. Allinson's *Lucian* is written in a different manner. His subject is a big one; as he says himself, 'the total amount attributed to Lucian occupies thirteen hundred and seven pages of the Teubner Greek text.' But his aim is mainly to give a lively and picturesque account of certain aspects of Lucian and his views, and a picture of the age in which he wrote. We are given chapters on Lucian's philosophy and ethics, and his treatment of the supernatural under the headings of the gods, applied superstition, and Christianity; and a miscellaneous chapter introduces some of the more interesting dialogues such as the *Cock*, where Dr. Allinson justly praises its 'entrancing humour.' In the second part of the book perhaps Dr. Allinson has insufficiently regarded his own warning that it is 'a temptation to identify as a far-flung ripple of his influence what may be of quite independent origin.' Great as was the influence of Lucian on the literature of later times, it may be questioned whether some of the works alluded to by Dr. Allinson were even indirectly affected by it. It is surely as unnecessary to attribute to Lucian the many stories of later times that deal with the possession of a man's shadow as to connect the frescoes on the walls of the Campo Santo at Pisa with the *Dialogues of the Dead*. He closes his list of works which derive from Lucian with Mr.

Hardie's *Gaisford Greek Prose* of 1922, but his translation of the witty quotation *τοὺς γῆν ἔχοντας λοιδορεῖ γεωργὸς ὁν* fails to bring out the point of the Greek.

Lucian is fond of metaphors. But Dr. Allinson far outrivals his subject in this respect, and the reader gets tired of his metaphorical and allusive style. He is probably little helped to the understanding of Lucian's influence by reading that his 'ghost gives forth no whisper at the behest of the cold-storage battery installed by Crawford in the outraged Mediterranean,' or that 'amazing use was made of the *Dialogues of the Dead* by feeding imitations of them into the hopper of periodic journalism.' We may imagine Lucian writing a companion work to the *Lexiphanes* in which Dr. Allinson would be indicted for using *τοσοῦτον ἐσμὸν ἀτόπων καὶ διαστρόφων μεταφορῶν*' Sometimes Dr. Allinson in his attempts at being lively is rather cheap. Phrases like 'the Rt. Reverend Syllogism,' 'a Platonic D.D.,' 'only the more attractive submarine life is allowed to show even a periscope,' seem rather unworthy of a book of this sort. But a graver departure from taste appears on page 94, where Dr. Allinson might remember that a sneer at the genuineness of some psychical phenomena is at least as 'anachronistic' as the 'credulity' of those who have accepted it as the result of careful and conscientious investigation.

The book is not free from typographical errors. 'Willful' (p. 7) and 'humourous' (p. 39) may be intentional departures from the commonly accepted norm, but 'omniverous' (p. 154) can hardly be thus defended, and Matthew Prior's dates (p. 163) are given as 1664-1672.

A. S. OWEN.

THE GREAT WAR OF 431-404.

The Great War between Athens and Sparta. By B. W. HENDERSON.

Pp. xiv + 517. Macmillan, 1927. 18s.
THIS book is primarily intended to help students of Thucydides at schools and universities.' With this end in view it makes no attempt to initiate

them into *Die Thukydidesfrage*, nor to post them up in the latest modern discussions (e.g., Professor West's valuable studies in the Archidamian War), nor yet to give more than an occasional glance at the political background of the war; but it provides an ample

running commentary on Thucydides' military narrative. Dr. Henderson's political views, where they find expression, boldly defy current fashions, and are supported by some forcible reasoning. He makes an effective rejoinder to those who fix the blame for the war upon Pericles, but deals somewhat cavalierly with the Spartans, whom he roundly calls the aggressors, and the Corinthians, whom he rules out as of little importance. He breaks several lances on behalf of Alcibiades, but leaves us in doubt as to whether he approves of his protégé's transactions with the Spartan envoys in 420 B.C., or of his advocacy on behalf of the Sicilian Expedition. On two other episodes concerning which students of Thucydides require some enlightenment, the diplomatic écarté of 421-0 B.C., and the Revolution of the Four Hundred, he is almost reticent. But the real test of the book should rather be sought in its military chapters. Here again we find some things unsaid which had better have been said. Why was Greek warfare seasonal? Why did it mostly consist of straightforward battles between long thin lines of hoplites? Why, with so many cities to take, were

so few taken? Students of Thucydides would no doubt be ready to sacrifice a few of the forty-five pages devoted to Demosthenes' campaigns on the north-western front for a discussion of these recurrent topics. On the other hand, Dr. Henderson's treatment of the individual episodes in the war both makes good reading, and with its numerous apt illustrations from modern warfare should prove very helpful. As examples of his robust good sense we would specially mention his criticisms of Pericles' strategy, and his account of the campaign of 418 B.C. One more growl: The 'new town' on the Strymon is Neopolis, not Neapolis (p. 405, n.); Androton was not an annalist 'of the time' (p. 28); Professor Vischer was a Swiss, not a German (p. 230); Professor Hude is Danish, not Dutch (p. 420, n. 1); and the ostraca hitherto discovered have proved to be pot-sherds, not oyster-shells (p. 332-3). Dr. Henderson writes in a breezy style, which stands in refreshing contrast to Thucydides' dry and scorching light. The present book will not carry the student of Thucydides over every part of the course, but so far as it goes it will be a pleasant and entertaining companion.

M. CARY.

THE LOEB PLATO. V.

Plato, with an English Translation. (Loeb Classical Library.) V. Lysis, Symposium, Gorgias. By W. R. M. LAMB, M.A. Pp. xx+536. London: Heinemann, 1925. Cloth, 10s.

IF not always successful in avoiding the stiffness of translation-English, Mr. Lamb abounds in felicitous renderings, and, as a whole, his version is very readable. I feel bound, however, to dissent from a good many of his interpretations of the Greek: e.g. *Smp.* 175B παρατίθετε . . . ἐπειδάν 'you are to set on . . . now that' (*cf. C.Q. XV.*, p. 4, and *Hermath. XVI.*, p. 211); 176D (*cf. 193B*) ὑπολαβόντα 'interrupted'; 178B (*cf. 180B*) τὸ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς πρεσβύτατον εἶναι τὸν θεόν τίμον 'of the most venerable are the honours of this god'; 191B εἴτε κτλ. 'to see if . . .'; 193A ἀπαντά is neglected or mistaken for ἀπαντί; 194C μή οὐχ οὗτοι ἡμεῖς

ώμεν 'we, perhaps, are the latter'; 196A τὸ πρῶτον does not go with ἔξιών; *ib.* δίαιτα 'seeking his food'; 197D ἀγανός 'superb'; 198B οὐχ ὁμοίως 'not so very'; 203D ἵτης 'strenuous'; 208D ὑπὲρ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν παίδων 'to save the children of his queen'; 216B ὄντινον is neglected; *Grg.* 451B δύα ἀνέκατερα τυγχάνῃ ὅντα 'and the question of how many units there are in each'; 451C τὰ μὲν ἄλλα 'in most respects'; 452C παρὰ Γοργίᾳ 'in Gorgias' view'; 472A ἐν Πινθίον 'at Delphi'; 474C ἐξ ἀρχῆς 'all over again'; 480C ἐπὶ τούναντιον 'to the contrary'; 490C περιστία λέγεις 'you talk of food'; 493E σαθρά 'decayed'; 497C θεμιτόν 'the proper thing'; 503B δι' ὄντινα αἰτίαν ἔχοντοι 'A. whom the Athenians have to thank'; 513D δ' οὖν 'however'; 523B καὶ ἔτι νεωστὶ τοῦ Διὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχοντος 'and still of late in the reign of

Zeus' (? about the time of Pericles' death, 503c); 525A ἔξουσίας καὶ τρυφῆς 'an unbridled course of fastidiousness' (fancy being sent to hell for fastidiousness!).

In an edition of this kind we are entitled to expect all conjectural readings to be noted, and Mr. Lamb perhaps promises as much in his slightly ambiguous preface: 'The Greek text of this volume is based on the recension of Schanz; a certain number of emendations by other¹ scholars have been adopted, and these are noted as they occur.' Unfortunately this is not so, the following conjectures in the *Grg.* alone being adopted tacitly: 465A ὡν προσφέρει Cornarius (? Ficinus); 467A εἰ δή Heindorf; 469D καταγήναι Burnet; 469E καὶ αἱ (Schaefer: Burnet is wrong in giving this as the MS. text); 485C παρά Stephanus; 485D νεανικόν Hein-

dorf; 492B ἀμόθει Bekker (ἀμόθει F); 493D οὐδ' ἀν ἄλλα Sauppe; 503D εἴη Burnet; 507B ἀλλ' ἀ δεῖ Heindorf; 510A ἀδικησομέν Heindorf. In *Smp.* 213B Mr. Lamb prints a very good conjecture of his own—κατιδεῖν. But is φθίνον destined to be ἀφθίτον in 211A?

In the Introductions and Notes I can only notice one or two points. P. 82: The suggestion that Glauco may be Charmides' father involves the odd assumption that Plato would have represented his own grandfather as strictly contemporary with himself. P. 158: ποιητῆς. P. 256: Among various proofs of what may be called the megaphone (or microphone) theory of 'the Platonic Socrates' Mr. Lamb includes 'an enthusiastic fluency [in the *Grg.*] which is hardly in keeping with Socrates' avowed dislike of lengthy speeches.' 'Yet the young men . . . found an irresistible attraction in . . . his fervent eloquence . . .' (p. xi). P. 482: Is it quite fair to the unsuspecting Loebite to let him run away with the notion that the fare from Egypt to the Piraeus was at the very most 'about two shillings'?

W. L. LORIMER.

CRIMINAL LAW IN GREECE.

The Growth of Criminal Law in Ancient Greece. By GEORGE M. CALHOUN. Pp. x + 149. Cambridge University Press for the University of California Press, Berkeley, 1927. 15s.

In quantity this slim volume may be regarded as short measure; the quality, however, of the contents is excellent. Lucid, well written, and interesting, it attacks with well-digested learning a difficult and little-known subject from rather a new angle. It establishes several important points which, I think, are new, and much of it is as interesting to the historian as to the student of jurisprudence.

The main part of the book is concerned with the attempt to trace from Homer, Hesiod, and the lyric poets the evolution of the idea of criminal law. Here the contention that the matter has hitherto been approached from the wrong angle owing to the disproportionate attention focused upon homicide

appears to be substantiated, though the author's scepticism as to the genuineness of the reference to purification in the *Aethiopis* rests upon the one instance of special pleading in the book. It is not really necessary to his thesis, and while it is, of course, quite true that the evidence is not as certain as it would be if we possessed the text of Arctinus, it is surely *a priori* much more probable that Proclus is right about it, than that he introduced the episode from his familiarity with the idea in later classical authors.

A good and interesting point is deduced from an examination of the technical names of Attic processes, viz. that the special forms of action (*εἰσαγγελία, ἀπαγωγή, φάσις κτλ.*) are of great antiquity and preceded rather than were added to *γραφή*. Probable, too, is the theory that Solon first introduced the requirement that public actions must be entered in writing.

Two things stand out very plainly in the later chapters of the book, the giant stature of Solon as a statesman and the degree to which Athens outstripped the

other states of Greece in her 'conception of those duties and powers of the state which are normally embodied in its criminal law.'

W. R. HALLIDAY.

SOME WORKS ON ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY.

S. Lönborg: *Dike und Eros: Menschen und Mächte im alten Athen.* Pp. 472. Munich: Oskar Beck, 1924.

É. Bréhier: *Histoire de la Philosophie.* I. *L'Antiquité et le moyen Âge; II. Période hellénistique et romaine.* Pp. 261-522 of tom. I. Paris: Alcan, 1927. 18 fr.

Adolfo Levi: *Sulle interpretazioni immanenzistiche della Filosofia di Platone.* Pp. vi + 240. Turin: Paravia, n.d.

Adolfo Levi: *Il Concetto del Tempo nei suoi rapporti coi problemi del divenire e dell'essere nella Filosofia di Platone.* Pp. 112. Turin: Paravia, n.d.

Julius Stenzel: *Wissenschaft und Staatsgesinnung bei Platon.* Pp. 16. Kiel: Lipsius and Tischer, 1927.

SUCH a list of publications, all of rather different character, is welcome evidence of the continued interest of harassed and post-war Europe in τὰ τερπνά ἀντίθετα. Mr. Lönborg's book, the most considerable in size on the list, is an eloquent and enthusiastic study of three typical Athenians—a statesman (Pericles), a poet (Euripides), and a philosopher (Socrates), the third requiring nearly half the volume to himself. Mr. Lönborg writes with knowledge and literary distinction, and has everywhere something to say which is worth pondering. Perhaps if he has a fault, it is that his enthusiasm sometimes outruns judgment. Thus it may be doubted whether the ἐπιτάφιος in Thucydides should be trusted implicitly as a picture of what Pericles had achieved for Athens. It is rather a description of the ideal of Pericles in his best moments, and it might be urged that Thucydides himself lets us see in his characteristic way, by ironies and silences, that even the Periclean ideal had a reverse to it. To take the speech as a statement of what the average Athenian actually was is to forget Dicaeopolis and Trygaeus and Strepsiades, who seem after all to have been pretty faithfully drawn

from the life. And, again, tempting as it is to depict the relation of Pericles to Aspasia as a 'marriage of true minds,' it is doubtful whether we ought to forget that Aspasia was, when all is said, an *hetaera*, and that the writers who created the literary legend of Aspasia seem all to have treated Pericles' connexion with her as a sensual weakness. This may, no doubt, be a misrepresentation, but we really have no means of proving the point. In the very sympathetic study of Euripides, regarded by the author as the greatest poet of Athens, free use has been made of the interpretations of Verrall and Murray, especially Murray. Mr. Lönborg combines Verrall's crusading 'rationalist' with Murray's 'feminist' into a composite photograph. He argues his points ably, but leaves me unconvinced. I think both he and Verrall forget the masterfulness of what R. L. S. called an imaginative writer's 'brownies.' If the *Alcestis* strikes us as a rather odd version of a resurrection, the reason may be not that Euripides set out on the superfluous mission of destroying a legend which it is unlikely any Athenian regarded seriously, but that his characters, like Scott's, 'came alive' and insisted on taking the conduct of the story into their own hands. That may be why the poet could not tell Socrates what his own works meant. The 'feminism,' too, is largely read into Euripides arbitrarily. It is assumed, for example, that Medea is a loving woman who has been turned into a 'fiend,' for the nonce, by the wrongs done to her by Jason. But, by Euripides' account of the matter, Medea was a sort of 'hell-cat' from the first, and there is really no proof that the poet's sympathies were not with the respectable Jason in his helpless attempt to escape from his entanglement. Nor is it clear that Murray is right in finding a satire on the 'Messian atrocity'

in the prologue to the *Troades*. On Mr. Lönborg's own showing, it seems clear that Euripides must have chosen his subject and applied for his chorus months before it was known what the upshot of the affair of Melos would be. The discussion of Socrates, though most interesting, shows the author at his most arbitrary. The 'irony' of Socrates is the chief feature of the picture—a feature taken solely from the Platonic accounts, yet Plato and Aristotle are both treated as quite unworthy of credit whenever it suits Mr. Lönborg's preconceived theory of what Socrates must have been. Aristotle was romancing when he credited Socrates with interest in $\tau\delta\ \kappa\alpha\theta\delta\lambda\omega\nu$ and 'definition'; Socrates never attempted a definition in his life. Plato's account of his encounter with Protagoras is 'not even a caricature'; he cannot have said much which Plato makes him say in the *Apology*. Yet Mr. Lönborg knows and tells us at some length just what Anytus must have said at the trial on the other side! (In point of fact, it was clearly because the responsible position of Anytus would not permit him to violate the 'amnesty' promoted by himself, by dwelling on the topics Mr. Lönborg mentions, that he needed a tool like Meletus to do the work.) The oddest of all the author's theses, and the one for which he pleads most passionately, is that the *Symposium* is a work of the last six or seven years of Plato's life—thus contemporary with the latest parts of the *Laws*—and closely connected with *Ep. VII*. Mr. Lönborg shows so much real insight in much that he says that I think it a grave pity he should have attempted his reconstruction of Socrates in so arbitrary a fashion. Occasionally he surprises me by imperfect knowledge, as when he seems to think it not impossible that Thucydides, son of Melesias, was Thucydides the historian, or when he reveals a belief that the *Alcibiades II.* is a genuine work of Plato.

Mr. Bréhier's book is a brief but careful and well-documented history of Greek philosophical thought from the death of Aristotle to the end of the fifth and opening of the sixth century

A.D., which should be very useful as a work of reference. It is an excellent feature of his treatment that he includes, as too many writers on the subject do not, Christian Patristic down to Augustine, Boethius, and 'Dionysius.' I could wish, on the other side, that he had permitted himself some sceptical doubt about the reality of the connexion of post-Aristotelian Cynicism, Cyrenaicism, and Megarianism with 'associates' of Socrates, and again about the very insufficient evidence on which Zeno of Citium has first been set down as a 'Semite' and then interpreted in the light of Hebrew prophecy, apocalyptic, and 'wisdom.'

For the special student, Mr. A. Levi's two undated little books are far the most important of those on our list, and, I should say, among the most important of recent studies in Platonic philosophy. The first of the two I do not hesitate to call a crushing and final refutation of all the numerous modern interpretations of Plato which replace ontology by 'theory of knowledge,' particularly of the widely popular neo-Kantian version of Platonism given by Natorp and his pupils. In the second, the author is grappling with one of the notorious supreme difficulties in Plato, the problem of the place of 'passage' and time in the cosmology of the *Timaeus*. To discuss these books properly, or even to indicate the main points in which I should myself agree or disagree with Mr. Levi, would be quite impossible within the limits imposed on me by the editors of the *Classical Review*. I may be allowed, perhaps, to mention that I have attempted a brief discussion elsewhere (*Mind N.S.* 118, pp. 214-220, April, 1921), and to express my opinion that no student of Plato can possibly afford to neglect work of such first-rate importance.

Dr. Stenzel's pamphlet contains the substance of a discourse held before the University on January 18, 1927 (the fifty-sixth anniversary of the foundation of the German Empire). The purpose of this finely-conceived lecture is to dwell on the nature of the special services which the thinker can render in the rebuilding of a worthy

and stable society after the shaking of social foundations by a world-wide 'crisis of civilisation,' and to illustrate the point by the functions assigned to the 'philosopher-king' in the *Republic*. Dr. Stenzel's grave and weighty words are worthy of his theme and its occasion, and men with the souls of scholars in this country will heartily sympathise with their spirit. Only, in the interests of accuracy, if for no other reason, I

could wish he had not depicted Plato as quite so much of a secularist and 'rationalist.' After all, the 'other world' is never far off in the pages of Plato, though he does not suppose that it is to be won by neglecting one's duties in this world. No balanced exegesis can ignore the fact that the 'philosopher-kings' are saints, as well as statesmen and mathematicians.

A. E. TAYLOR.

THE GREEK PERFECT.

Histoire du Parfait Grec. (Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris, XXI.). Par PIERRE CHANTRAIN. Pp. 268. Paris: Champion, 1927.

THIS study of the Greek Perfect is inspired, as its author acknowledges in the preface and elsewhere, by Wackernagel's *Studien zum griechischen Perfektum* (Göttingen, 1904; 24 pp.) and by Meillet's articles in the *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique*, XXIII., p. 64; XXIV., p. 110; XXV., p. 95 (1922-24).

Wackernagel (developing a thesis of H. Malden, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1865, p. 168) showed that the Perfect in Homer is never 'resultative,' i.e. never expresses the permanence in an object of the result of the action expressed in the verb. Perfect forms having this kind of meaning are not found before the fifth century, and from that time become gradually commoner. Pindar's ἀλλ' Ὅμηρός τοι τετίμακεν (*Odysseus*) δί' ἀνθρώπων is one of the earliest examples. This and the other results of Wackernagel's essay receive ample corroboration from M. Chantraine's more statistical treatment.

Meillet has suggested that the oldest Preterite corresponding to φέσθαι is φάτο, and that ἔφη, though found in Homer, is of recent origin. He notes a similar

relation between ἔσκε and ἔκτο, and infers that the so-called Middle endings were not originally opposed in sense to the so-called Active endings. From the correspondence between φάτο and Lat. fātūr he further infers that -το is not essentially a Preterite ending.

M. Chantraine's search for additional evidence confirmatory of this theory seems to have had negative results. Of the list of perfect and pluperfect forms with Middle endings which he offers on pp. 47 ff., many are Passive in sense, so that, although consistent with Meillet's hypothesis, they can be explained without it. The recognition of a Middle ending in ἄνωχθε is difficult so long as no account is given of ἄνώχθω. The attempt to prove the priority of -το over -ται is unsuccessful: on p. 60 it is suggested that the Perfect Middle is of later origin than the Pluperfect Middle, but on p. 69 the suggestion is so modified as to be virtually given up. Nor is the attempt to prove the recent origin of the Pluperfect with 'Active' endings more successful. The stage of the language to which Meillet's theory (if true) carries us back seems, in fact, to be so early that hardly any traces of it remain in Homer, and the difficulty of demonstration is very great.

R. MCKENZIE.

LATIN PROSE-RHYME.

Die Lateinische Reimprosa. Von K. POLHEIM. Pp. xx+539. Berlin: Weidmann, 1925. M. 27.

CICERO tells us that there are two ingredients in prose-rhythm. The first of these is the use of numeri or metrical

cadences, which was supposed to owe its origin to Thrasymachus. The second element is described as *constructio verborum* or *concinnitas*. This was provided by certain σχήματα which were said to have been invented by Gorgias, viz.

Plato
and
other
es of
that it
utes
gesis
philoso-
al as
OR.

and
lings
se to
the
Lat.
not

onal
eory
Of
orms
fers
ense,
Meil-
ined
middle
g as
The
over
sug-
s of
iddle,
ified
the
the
more
image
ries
that
ner,
n is

e.

owe
ond
ver-
led
to
riz

constant antitheses, parallel clauses of equal length, answering each other, and winding up with homoeoteleuta. Cicero lays equal stress upon both of these elements. Modern students of prose-rhythm, however, have concentrated their attention upon the *numeri* of the *clausulae*, and have tended to neglect the other element. Polheim's point of view is quite different. His interest is not in prose-rhythm, but in prose-rhyme.

The metrical clausulae of Cicero and his school were succeeded in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. by an accentual system, still more rigid than that which it replaced. At a later date this became crystallised in the mediaeval *cursus*, with its three forms, *planus*, *tardus*, *velox*, corresponding to the three favourite cadences of Cicero. All this is now well known, and needs no discussion here. There is, however, another aspect of the question which Polheim has brought to the front. This is the influence of the *Gorgiea σχήματα*, and in particular of *όροιστέλευτα*, on late and mediaeval prose. The most interesting point is that in accentual Latin similarity of endings was felt to be insufficient in itself, and was reinforced by actual rhyme.

This short introduction has been made, since Polheim's method of treating the subject is somewhat strange. He plunges at once in *medias res*, and in Ch. I. discusses the compositions of that charming personality Hroswitha of Gandersheim (tenth century). Hroswitha said of her poems :

Huc ego cum recubo me taedia multa capessunt,
An sit prosaicum nescio an metricum.

She would have been surprised if it had been possible for her to see the elaborate results of modern analysis. We are told that her rhyme is generally *einsilbig*, i.e. that it resides in the final vowel only, whereas at a later date it is extended to the last two or last three vowels.

In Ch. II. two lives of Queen Matilda are discussed. The first of these, written at the end of the tenth century, is free from rhyme; while the second, written early in the eleventh century, is rhymed. Ch. III. is called 'Rhyme and Cursus.' It begins with an account of the Polish

Chronicle ascribed to Martinus Gallus, and then goes on to give rules both for rhyme and for the mediaeval *cursus*. This necessary information ought to have come earlier in the book. Ch. IV. contains an astonishing list of documents, both Royal and private, the latter being arranged by sees in the case of Germany. Instances are also given from France, Italy, Sicily, and from Papal Bulls. Ch. V. is headed 'History of Rhyme in Latin Prose.' As a matter of fact, it deals exclusively with Gorgias and other Greek theorists. Ch. VI. is headed 'Cicero,' but he plays a small part in the discussion, possibly because, in Polheim's opinion, he does not distinguish clearly between *similiter cadens* and *similiter desinens*. In this respect the *Auctor ad Herennium* is held to be more satisfactory. Rutilius Rufus, an obscure contemporary of Seneca, receives a pat on the back. Since, however, his work was translated from the Greek of a later Gorgias, a contemporary of Cicero (*Quint.* IX. 2. 102), it is not obvious why he should be considered an exponent of Roman theory. The practice of Cicero and other Latin authors is then discussed. In this context brief references are made to the use of *numeri* proper, a subject which Polheim generally avoids, as outside the range of his enquiry. Chap. VII. deals with African writers, Pagan and Christian, notably Apuleius, Minucius Felix, Tertullian, and Cyprian. We are told, not without reason, that in their writings the next great step in the development of prose-rhyme is to be observed. It is clear at the first glance that Apuleius was a devout disciple of Gorgias. Ch. VIII. deals very minutely with the technique of Augustine and his successors. Ch. IX. is headed 'Venantius Fortunatus,' but also deals with Leo, Cassiodorus, Fulgentius, and Gregory. Ch. X. is mainly concerned with Isidorus, but also deals with Aldhelm and Bede. We are told that the use of rhyme was generally avoided by the Anglo-Saxons and Irish. Ch. XI. is devoted to the scholars of the Renaissance under Charlemagne and his successors, e.g. Alcuin, Hrabanus Maurus, and Gottschalk. Ch. XII. deals with the

culmination of prose-rhyme. Hroswitha was an early bloom, the 'full flower' is to be seen in the eleventh century. 'The number of documents grows speedily, the artistic form becomes universal, its absence remarkable' (p. 363). The rhyme no longer resides in the final vowel, but in the last two, or last three vowels.

The universality of the practice is shown by an amazing list of documents arranged according to the provinces of Germany and France; also lists are given for Italy, Spain, and England. Ch. XIII. deals with the decline of the system, and Ch. XIV. with survivals in later theorists from Aeneas Sylvius in the fifteenth century down to 1901.

Polheim's book is very long, and his method of presenting the facts is open to criticism. There can, however, be no doubt about his stupendous erudition and capacity for taking pains. His work will appeal most to students of history and mediaeval literature. Its importance for textual criticism, for questions of genuineness, provenance, and authorship is great, though he himself points out that it must be used with caution. It is also of great value for the study of prose-rhythm, since it deals with a side of this which has not been treated by recent writers. In particular, writers upon the *cursus* must in the future consider not only rhythm but rhyme.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

ENGRAVED GEMS IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

Catalogue of the Engraved Gems and Cameos, Greek, Etruscan, and Roman in the British Museum. By H. B. WALTERS. Revised and enlarged edition. Pp. lxii + 420 with 44 plates, 4to. London, 1926.

In 1888 the British Museum published its first *Catalogue of engraved Gems*, a summary description of 2,349 specimens with a couple of indexes, a frontispiece, and nine plates. This useful little work suffered from two defects—imperfect classification (no attempt was made to subdivide that convenient category 'Graeco-Roman gems') and inadequate illustration (206 stones only were figured). In both directions Furtwängler showed the way to better things. His great treatise *Die antiken Gemmen*, which appeared in 1900, mapped out the whole subject with masterly understanding and filled in most of its provinces with a wealth of critical investigation. Moreover, his catalogue of the Berlin collection had classified no fewer than 11,872 specimens, and illustrated a large portion of them on 71 photographic plates. This splendid example was not lost on the authorities of the British Museum. As fresh acquisitions were made it became clear that the *Catalogue* must be not only revised but rewritten and produced upon a worthier scale. The work was

entrusted to Mr. H. B. Walters, who has incorporated much material gathered by Mr. A. H. Smith, and has successfully completed the handsome quarto issued in 1926.

It contains an Introduction, a brief description of 4,080 stones, several elaborate indexes, and 44 plates representing almost all the more important and many of the less important items.

And here it must be said that the plates, though good, are not so good as those in the original edition. Individual photographs are not sharp and 'plucky.' Here and there, too, the figures are wrongly numbered; thus on Pl. 2, Fig. 77 should be 78, Fig. 78 should be 86, Fig. 86 should be 77. The increased number of plates is a thing to be thankful for; but even now they are not numerous enough. The Museum—apart from its incomparable series of coin-catalogues—has been slow to realise the supreme importance of illustration. Presumably the defence is lack of funds. But a good illustration will often save much printed description and may even prove economical. In any case room might have been found for one or two plates of enlarged photographs: magnification by two or three diameters certainly facilitates stylistic study.

Much more satisfactory is the text,

which marks a great advance on that of its predecessor, and is in fact an admirable inventory of the Museum treasures. Mr. Walters is an old hand at cataloguing and knows well enough when to dilate and when to contract his commentary. He has carried through an arduous job with fidelity and sound sense.

Students of history will remark the survival of 'Minoan' shapes and motives into the 'geometrical' period (Nos. 155-219) and even into the sixth century (No. 452, Ionian work, to which there is a good parallel now in the Fitzwilliam collection). They will note that mythological figures of a definitely Greek type appear first on 'geometrical' stones—e.g., Pegasus (Nos. 168, 205 ff.), the Centaur (Nos. 173 f.), the Chimaira (No. 208), the Gorgoneion (No. 231), Herakles wrestling with Nereus (No. 212).

The signed gems of the collection include a steatite scarabaeoid (No. 492) by Syries, the earliest known engraver (c. 500 B.C.); a beautiful chalcedony (No. 601) by the fourth-century artist Onatas, with Nike affixing a sword to a trophy; and a choice, though fragmentary, sardonyx cameo (No. 3564) by Ant[eros?] of the Early Empire, representing Paris and Aphrodite. Besides, it can hardly be doubted that the wild goose flying (No. 511), an amazing piece of naturalism, if not also the equally characteristic harper (No. 529), is from the hand of Dexamenos himself. Lovers of beauty will indeed find quite a number of *chef-d'œuvre* in this volume. They must not miss the burnt sard with the man playing a *magadis* (No. 563), the sliced sard with the girl at a fountain, not a mere *stele*, as the Catalogue has it (No. 561), the lapis lazuli with the nude crouching woman who passes a *chiton* over her head and is thereby transformed before our eyes into Aphrodite emerging from a mussel-shell (No. 530).

Identifiable portraits—and some of the very best cannot be identified (e.g.,

Nos. 1182, 1190, 2034)—include, not only a long list of kings and potentates, but also such miscellaneous celebrities as Anakreon, Sokrates, Platon, Aristippos, Demosthenes, Epikouros, Cicero, Horace, Antinous.

Among the more interesting religious scenes and personages are the evocation of the dead by Hermes (Nos. 954, 955), divination by means of a human head (Nos. 995-998), a medical consultation in the presence of Asklepios (No. 2176), the bust of Sarapis in lapis lazuli (No. 3939), Hera *Ourania* on a lion (No. 1288), the head of Ianus *quadrifrons* (No. 714), the tests of Iuno *Sospita* (Nos. 1032-1035, 1129, 1130), and the remarkable group of deities inscribed *έκκλησιά θεῶν* ἐν Ὀλύνπῳ (No. 1241).

The naturalist can find here animals galore from a sunfish (No. 3972) to a Bactrian camel (Nos. 546, 547), though it might puzzle him to account for a heron 'with large deer's antler in place of crest' (No. 553).

In conclusion let it be said that there are plenty of other problems still to be solved within the two covers of this intriguing book. What did the author of the Platonic *Eryxias* really mean by his statement (400B) that the Aithiopes used λίθοι ἔγγεγλυμμένοι as money? Why should the portrait-bust of an elderly Roman, wearing a cuirass, have a formidable nail stuck in the back of his neck (No. 2043)? How are we to construe

σεργοῦσι μονκαδό σμοιχαρίν
(Mr. Walters reads σ(τ)έργοις μον καὶ δός μοι χάριν) and round it
τοπωσηφσυνπαρδσγδθητε

. . . (No. 2702)? A cameo with an unintelligible inscription of five lines (No. 3701) is even more of a conundrum and reminds us that a thorough-going Catalogue (better still, a *Corpus*) of 'Gnostic' gems—one of the most urgent needs of late classical archaeology—would form a fitting supplement to the work so well begun by Mr. Smith and Mr. Walters.

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

PAPYRI AT CORNELL.

Greek Papyri in the Library of Cornell University. Edited by WILLIAM LINN WESTERMANN and CASPER J. KRAEMER, Jr. Pp. xx+287; 19 plates. New York: Columbia University Press, 1926.

THIS volume may be regarded as the firstfruits of the interest in papyrology which the University of Michigan, represented by the late Professor Kelsey, has done so much to stimulate in the United States. Cornell University has shared in the recent purchases of papyri, and the work of preparing its acquisitions for publication was undertaken by Professor Westermann while still at that University. The issue of the present volume, in which he has collaborated with Professor Kraemer since his removal to New York, marks the commencement of the task of making accessible the already large stock of papyri in American libraries. This volume contains only a selection of the Cornell texts. Five are of the Ptolemaic period, the remainder of the Roman, though one or two from the reign of Diocletian are included. They are carefully edited, with translations, notes,

and detailed introductions, and the excellent facsimiles make it possible to check the editors' readings of many documents. There are the usual indexes.

First editions of papyrus texts, unless the originals are unusually legible and complete, are nearly always susceptible of improvement, and this volume is no exception. There are, moreover, some errors which seem due to lack of experience in the decipherment of papyri, a kind of work which demands long practice. Vitelli has published a number of corrections in *Studi italiani*, N.S. V., fasc. 1, and others might be added; but there remains a large amount of solid and painstaking work, and the volume is a valuable addition to papyrological literature. Several of the documents are of unusual interest, notably Nos. 1, a very important and well-preserved account of oil from the famous Zeno archive, and 20, a collection of returns of landed property, which throws light (particularly as ably interpreted by the editors) on the census of A.D. 302. No. 21, a long tax account, is also made to yield useful results.

H. I. BELL.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF VIRGIL'S ART.

The Development of Virgil's Art. By HENRY W. PRESCOTT. Pp. xi+490. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1927. 20s.

THE purpose of this book, according to the author's preface, is to offer an interpretation of Virgil which shall indicate his place in the history of literature and in the development of literary types. 'In general,' he adds, 'only those features of the poet's art are treated which can be appreciated without a knowledge of the poem in its Latin form.' Yet he claims to have had regard throughout 'for the practical need of teachers and students.' Teachers—if by that term is meant teachers of the classics—may perhaps get some suggestions from the volume. But for the student who either cannot or will not read Virgil in Latin it is, at

best, useless, and may be worse. The analysis of the contents of the *Aeneid*, based on Heinze's *Epische Technik*, of which about half the volume consists, is futile for those who have not read the *Aeneid*; and it is not clear what purpose it serves for those who have. It may be conjectured that anyone who is told that in the Tenth Eclogue there are 'deficient vigour and originality,' not 'redeemed by the expression of genuine feeling,' will conclude that Mr. Prescott must be right in saying that there is hardly more in it than an agreeable prettiness, and will consider himself lucky in being warned off reading it. So, too, with the *Georgics*: 'the details of Virgil's procedure,' Mr. Prescott observes with a touch almost of pathos, 'are not easily described apart from the Latin text'; but why should they be? Or with the *Aeneid*: 'Dido's

story is that of an abandoned sweetheart'; a view possibly deriving from the statement, given as a quotation from Virgil, that 'Dido drank both long and deep of love and wine'—*longumque bibebat anorem!* Here and there, it is only fair to add, one comes on remarks which are appreciative and even illuminating: that Juno throughout 'acts much like the human being struggling against destiny'; that the

action of the wanderings suffers serious disturbance from the prominence given in it to Apollo, 'as a colonisation god' the author says, but also, he should have added, as the new representative deity of the Augustan reformation; that the sufferers in the Mourning Fields are all women; and that in the visions of Book VI. Virgil has avoided contradictions by withholding any explicit statement of theory.

J. W. MACKAIL.

BOURGERY'S LUCAN.

Lucain : La Guerre Civile (La Pharsale). Tome I, Livres I-V. Texte établi et traduit par A. BOURGERY. Pp. xxviii+169 (really 338). Paris : Société d'édition 'Les belles lettres,' 1926 (really 1927). 26 fr.

THIS translation is not quite all that a translation should be.

The meaning of Latin words is not understood. I 442 *tonse* 'rasé', II 103 *stat crux in templis* 'des mares de sang montent devant les temples', 430 *Sabello* 'sabin', 685 *salo* 'l'onde amère' (sale), 707 *ora* 'rivages' (oras), III 485 *perpetuum* (cratem) 'immense', 681 *pinguisbus* (taedis) 'grosses', 687 *recipit fluctus* 's'engloutit dans les flots', 734 *distentis palmis* 'se tordit les mains', IV 241 *tument fauces* 'leur gosier se dilate', 664 *indulxit castris* 'installa son camp', V 132 *pressit deum* 'a chassé le dieu'. I presume that I 482 'antiques' and IV 598 'formes' are misprints (misprints are frequent), and that V 268 'du monde' for *arctois*, 570 'rivage' for *puppim*, and 768 'plus cher' for *tutius* are slips of the pen.

A word capable of two meanings is given the wrong one. I 87 *male concordes* (pestilent cabal) 'concorde peu sûre', 413 (and IV 435) *secundo* (second) 'favorable', 629 *micat* (throbs) 'brille', II 438 *cessere* (fell to the share of) *Peloro* 'se sont éloignés du Pélore', 691 *ultima* (Virgo) 'à son déclin' (she was rising), III 174 *inpiger* (Cephalos) 'diligent', 201 *sparsam profundo* (sea-besprinkled) 'égarée dans les flots', IV 31 *prope* (close) 'presque', 72 f. *summus Olympi cardo* (the occident) 'le pôle de l'Olympe', 109 *medios* (zodiacal and therefore torrid) 'tempérées', 387 *frus-*

tra (ill-advisedly) 'en vain', 496 *nostris fatis* (in our deaths) 'à nos destins', V 389 f. *nomen inane imperii* 'un titre sans pouvoir' (Caesar's consulship!). Add I 235 *tenuerunt*, II 585 *hinc* and *ad*, III 233 *post*, 465 *rapta*, 537 *summis*, IV 431 *cunctas*, V 380 *exit*, 709 *modum*.

Words are wrongly construed in the sentence. I 491 *urget* (quisque) with *impetus*, II 225 *mulium* (maiore) with *coitum* (translated as coit), 494 *pauori* (latebras quaesisse) with *satis est*, 578 *pelagi* (metuens) with *fretum*, III 214 *desertus* (predicate) as epithet (of Orontes!), 646 *hac cum parte* (luctata) with *tulerunt*, 762 *primus* (addidit) with *victor*, IV 371 *gurgite* (plenis) with *egens* (and iam rendered 'toujours'), 410 *tuta* (acc. plur.) with *fames*, V 8 *belli per munia* (uagos) with *elicit*, 125 *circum latices* (uagam) with *corripuit*, 194 f. *discriminis* (expers) with *minas* and *bellorum* (minas) with *expers*, 398 *tantum* (adverb) with *tempus*, 407 *Brundusii* (tecta) with *undas*, 720 *aqulonibus* (dative) as ablative. Particularly absurd is the translation of *incerta umbra* IV 725.

The sense and even the construction of the Latin is reversed. II 35 f. *nullis defuit aris* | *inuidiam factura parens* 'aucun autel ne manqua de mères, soucieuses de ne pas susciter de jalouse'; 260 f. *ne tantum . . . liceat feralibus armis*, | *has etiam mouisse manus* 'ne permettez pas . . . que ces mains aussi brandissent des armes funestes'; 503 f. *ingreditur pulsa fluuium statione uacantem* | *Caesar et ad tutas hostis* (nom.) *conpellitur arcis* 'César chasse les défenseurs, entre dans le fleuve et se laisse entraîner jusqu'aux citadelles

sûres de l'ennemi'; III 593 f. *nullam melius . . . carinae | audiunre manum* 'aucune carène n'écoute mieux la main'; IV 656-8 *sed maiora dedit cognomina collibus istis . . . Scipio* 'mais elle (l'antiquité) donna à ces collines un plus glorieux surnom . . . Scipion'; V 102-4 *hoc . . . numen ab humani solum (nom.) se labe furoris | uindicat* 'cette divinité ne s'écarte que de la souillure de la fureur humaine'; 149 f. *nullo confusae murmure uocis | instinctam sacro mentem testata furore* 'elle atteste d'une voix trop distincte que son esprit est poussé par un délice sacré'; 267 f. *fudisse cruorem | quid (nos) iuuat?* 'à quoi te sert d'avoir répandu le sang?' 349-51 *quisquis mea signa relinquens | non Pompeianis tradit sua partibus arma,* *hic numquam uult esse meus,* 'quand on abandonne nos enseignes même sans livrer ses armes au parti pompeien, c'est qu'on ne veut jamais être à moi' (the insertion of 'même' inverts the sense and ruins the point, as does 'seul' in IV 573); 458 f. *coepere . . . aequora classem | curua sequi* 'la flotte suivit les ondulations de la houle'; 546 f. *non . . . orbis medii puros exesa recessus* 'les pures lignes de sa courbe étaient rongées'. 694 f. *mundi iam summa tenentem | permisisse mari tantum!* 'abandonner à la mer celui qui tient l'empire du monde!' After these experiences one cannot feel sure that 'qui' at V 164 is a misprint for 'que'.

The French sometimes has hardly any relation to the Latin. In certain cases the error can be traced and analysed: II 489 f. *praecipitem cohibete ducem; uictoria nobis | hic primum stans Caesar erit* 'ici pour la première fois César restera immobile' (a whole verse skipped); III 664 *robora cum uetitis prensarent altius ulnis* 'ils cherchaient à saisir plus haut les aunes interdits' (*uetitis ulnis* translated as *uetitas alnos* and *robora* then thrown overboard); IV 22 f. *nam gurgite mixto, | qui praestat (nomen) terris, aufert tibi nomen Hiberus* 'car, y mêlant la masse de ses eaux, le roi de ces terres, l'Ebre, te ravit ton nom'; V 615 f. *quoties frustra pulsatos aequore montis | obruit illa dies!* 'combien de montagnes jusque-là battues des flots s'effondrèrent en ce jour!' (*quoties* mistaken for *quot* and

frustra ignored). But oftener one is left to guess and wonder: II 126-8 *te quoque neglectum uiolatae, Scaeula, dextræ . . . mactauere* 'toi aussi, Scévola, sans égard pour la main que brûla ton ancêtre, on t'égorgea'; 306 f. *utinam . . . deis . . . licaret | hoc caput . . . damnatum exponere* 'si seulement les dieux . . . me permettaient d'exposer ma tête condamnée'; III 132 *pacis ad exhaustae spolium non cogit egestas* 'la paix que tu as bannie ne t'a pas réduit à une pauvreté qui te force à nous dépouiller'; 183 *tresque petunt ueram credi Salamina carinae* 'et trois carènes gagnent Salamine qu'il faut pourtant croire véritable'; IV 34 f. *huc hostem paritor terrorque pudorque | impulit* 'dans cette ville la terreur comme la prudence à la fois saisirent l'ennemi'; 154 f. *donec decresceret umbra | in medium surgente die* 'jusqu'à ce que le jour, arrivé en son milieu, commence à décroître'; V 439 f. *nec pernia uelis | aequora frangit eques* 'le cavalier ne brise pas les flots qui lui livrent accès jusqu'aux voiles'.

Lest it should be thought that these specimens are exceptional, I will first give a bare list, itself only a selection, of other mistranslations, many of which are equally bad but cannot be exposed so briefly; and I will then examine the first page, containing only 12 verses.

I 91, 147, 451, 536, 596, II 52 f., 89, 95 f., 212, 214-7, 219, 410-2, 476, 712, 732-4, III 37, 115 f., 143, 194, 208, 251, 253 f., 259, 345 f., 524 f., 548, 624-6, 642, 670, IV 11 f., 60, 112 f., 137, 163 f., 168, 189, 243 f., 534, 615, 684, 733, 818, V 96, 355, 371 f., 385, 411, 483 f., 500-3, 505 f., 549, 602, 706 f., 746 f., 791 f.

I 4 *rupto foedere regni* (when the covenant of tyranny was broken, 86 *foedera regni*) is translated 'rompant l'unité de l'empire'. 8 f. are an exclamation in the Latin, an interrogation in the French, 10-2 an interrogation in the Latin, an affirmation in the French. The *que* of 10, being intolerable, is left untranslated, a refuge to which Mr Bourgery betakes himself again at I 681, III 78 and 327. I may also notice two annotations. '8 et 9 recte coniungi probat Sen. n. q. V 15 3': to say '8 et 9 recte disiungi probant Sil.

I 385, Stat. *Theb.* II 212 sq., Drac. *Rom.* V 1' would be equally false but less absurd. '11 *inulta* : -te Acro *carm.* I 2 51': this piece of misinformation is copied from Hosius, who took it in 1892 from some now obsolete edition of Acro.

Mr Bourgery often prints one reading or punctuation and translates another: I 397 f., 646 f., II 348, 387, 541, 595, 703, III 276, IV 217, 705, 740-2, V 211, 218, 300, 313, 576. Words, phrases, and even whole verses are left without translation at I 603, II 263 f., 462, 589, 726 f., III 35, 137 f., 320, 441, IV 58, 93, 303, 430, 633, 662, 696, 806, V 89 f., 227, 285, 380, 526, 714.

The few novelties in Mr Bourgery's text are mostly readings taken from the MS which he has made his pet, Z. One of these is *sequimur* II 320, which reminds me that III 722 *caecā tela manu . . . mittit* is rendered 'il lance de sa main . . . des traits aveugles'. He says on p. xvi that he has adopted Z's orthography: he does indeed adopt its false spellings *repulit*, *Sylla*, *sobole*, *littora*, *Aegeas*, but its true spellings *Suebos* and *nequiquam* he rejects. He has collated it more minutely than

Hosius, and some new details, though not important, are interesting (e.g. V 257 *timorist*); but unfortunately his accuracy cannot be trusted. The dates of the MSS on p. xxvii disagree in four cases with those given in the preface. The explanatory notes on book I contain 28 references to other ancient authors, of which 11 are false. These notes, by the way, chiefly of a somewhat elementary nature, offer scraps of gratuitous misinformation: II 691 'en réalité Pompée partit au commencement . . . de l'été', III 272 *Croeso fatalis Halys* 'Crésus y fut vaincu par Cyrus', IV 322 'c'est sur l'Ida phrygien que les auteurs font habituellement pousser l'aconit', 552 'Jason sema les dents du dragon qui gardait la toison d'or', V 716 *litera* 'sans doute le lambda grec'.

In short, Mr. Bourgery is not fully equipped for his task; and in consequence his numerous decisions and pronouncements on matters of interpretation and criticism, even when fortified with 'sans doute' or 'évidemment,' carry no authority and are of little importance.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

OLD CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS.

Inscriptiones latinae christianaee veteres.
Edidit ERNESTUS DIEHL. Vol. I., fasc. 6; pp. i-xiii + 401-488. Vol. II., fasc. 1-5; pp. i-400. Berlin: Weidmann, 1925-6. M. 5.25, M. 3.75 each.

THE first five fascicles of this important work were noticed in *C.R.*, 1925, pp. 206 f. Editor and printer have combined to perform a difficult task with signal accuracy, and produced a book as creditable to German typography as to German scholarship. Many of the texts are uninteresting; they have, however, linguistic value (as for instance in presenting such forms as *ispes*, *ispiritus*, *Istratonicæ*, *iscelerata*, *Estephane*, *esponsa*,¹ or again *prise* for

provinciae, 3620). The names commemorated are sometimes noteworthy. Particularly striking among new formations is *Refrigerius* (2603: *Refriceria*, 3804C), based on the *refrigerium* or cool calm desired hereafter (cf. 2304 ff.). It illustrates well the otherworldliness which many of these texts show.² By its side the older ideas linger on, as for instance in 2285 *Manes estote boni ut Martis in parc bono quiescat*, which is very like the end of the *Laudatio Turiae* (Dessau 8393. 79 te di Manes tui ut quietam patiantur atque ita tueantur opto) and in 3387 *cuius spiritus inter deos receptus est*, and the old popular reflections; so 3437 *brue omne quod bonum est*; 3463 *non uitium mors, consuetudo propria natis*; 3525 *ec ton emon panton tuto emon* (cf.

¹ In 3422. 7 *iscanderint* may well be for *scanderint* rather than for *inscanderint*. Whether the numerous Biblical quotations in these texts help us to determine the local prevalence of particular versions, and how far they are liturgically inspired, should perhaps be investigated.

² Cf. 2769 *caruit minas saeculi*; 3348 *mundi tristitias exhorruisti*; 3457 *cupidi tamen sumus mortis ut in illum priorem secessum profugiamus*; my *Sallustius LXXIX.* n. 177. On Christian names cf. J. Moffatt, *E.R.E.* IX. 145 ff.

3661); 3865 *cod estis fui et quod sum esse abetis.*

I pass to a few points of detail. 2100 *sanc-*
tum martyrum qui sunt passi sub praeside
Floro in ciuitate Milevitanam in diebus turifca-
tionis. The phrase *i.d.t.* is noteworthy as a
description of the compulsory offering of incense
on pain of martyrdom as recorded in the *libelli*.

2166. 6 *temporis angusti*, cf. *Lucan I. 98*, not
necessarily a reminiscence, though the pre-
ceding line contains a clear Horatian quotation.

2167. 10 *ad dñm meliore uia*, cf. *Lucan IX. 394*
ad dominum meliore uia.

2388 *Iesu Christus ligabit te, bratus dei et*
sigillus Salomoniz. abis nocturna, non baleas ad
anima pura et supra quisuis sis. quisquis is
presumably for quisquis, and Diehl's suggestion
superam unnecessary: 'above thee, whatever
thou art.' The *avis nocturna* is the owl, which
is represented on the plate bearing this inscription.
Jewish belief that it was unclean com-
bines with the Graeco-Roman idea that it had
the Evil Eye.¹

2388C *inuide quid laceras illos quos crescere*
sentis? tu tibi tortor. tu tecum tua bulnera
portas. With *inuide quid laceras*, cf. Ovid,

¹ Cf. P. Perdrizet, *Bull. soc. ant. France*, 1903, 164 ff. The Latin proverb *cum pfeius*
formidant quam fullones ululam (*Varro, Men.*
539 Buech, used in jest at Pompeii, *Notizie*
delle scavi, 1884, 50, 111; 1913, 147 = C.L.E.
1936 Lommatsch) has a double point; the
ulula is a bird of ill omen, and it is specially
connected with the fullers, as both are under
Minerva's protection (cf. a Pompeian painting
of the fuller's *Quinquestratus* with owls perched
on their apparatus; Dar-Saglio, *Dict. II. 1350*,
Fig. 3302); there may be an allusion to the
night work of the fullers (*Titin. Com. 27 nec*
nocuit nec diu licet fullonibus quiescere) and their
pallor, comically interpreted as due to fear of
their characteristic bird.

Ex Ponto IV. 16. 1. For the idea of *illos quos*
crescere sentis, cf. *Sil. Ital. XVI. 188 o nihil*
unquam | crescere nec magnas patiens exsurgere
laudes | inuidia. The view of Monceaux that
the text contains a reminiscence of S. Cyprian
is uncertain; yet cf. a certain quotation from
him in a text from Gaul, 2500B.

2388D *inuide in faciem.* Diehl remarks
'sensus obscurus.' Is it not 'Take this blow in
the face (and in particular in the eye, the seat
of the envious man's malign power)?'

3303. 6 *di]scide peccat[or rather than in]scide*
peccator.

3441.A 10 Perhaps *defensor sacrae sedulus*
esse domus.

3826. 3 *cui loco religioso accedere uolo omne*
edificium adiacens. Warde Fowler's distinction
between *loca sacra*, places legally consecrated,
and *loca religiosa*, places about which you feel
there is something numinous,² does not hold in
Latin use under the Empire; cf. Blume-Lach-
mann-Rudorff, *Schr. röm. Feldmesser*, II. 460 f.,
for *l. r.* of graves and the surrounding gardens,
etc.

4301. 3 *qui licet immaturo obitu distitutus,*
tamen superstibus omnibus filis suis adque
uxore deficit is an interesting example of the
strength of the ancient desire that one's off-
spring should be *superstes*, and deserves to be
quoted in illustration of the grotesque example
of that feeling in *Lucan III. 747 ff.*

It would perhaps be rash to imitate
the Spartan ambassador and prophecy,
'This book will be the beginning of
many dissertations,' but it is safe to say
that it will give a new impulse to work
on this subject, and be of great service
to many whose studies occasionally
lead them within its circle.

A. D. NOCK.

² *Hibbert Journal*, V. (1907), 847 f.

MYTH AND CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

Myth and Constantine the Great. By
VACHER BURCH, D.D. Pp. x+232.
London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford
University Press: 1927. 10s. net.

The present work is intended for the
specialist, not for the general reader.
This is evident not only from the title,
but from the fact that Dr. Burch prefaches
his book with no general account of the
universally accepted facts about
Constantine, but plunges at once into his
theme, which is to determine the substratum
of truth underlying the legends about
Constantine in the *Liber Pontificalis* and
other late works. The headings of his
chapters are: 'General Observations on
the Simpler Constantine Myths,' 'Con-

stantine and Baptism,' 'Constantine and
Anthousa,' 'Constantine and Claudian
Descent,' 'Constantine and the Founding
of the City,' 'Constantine and the
Building of Churches,' 'Constantine and
the Convocation of the Jewish Disputants,' 'Constantine and Oratory.'

Whether one accepts his contention
that a lost *Vita Constantini* forms the
kernel of the later legends or not, there
can, I think, be little doubt that Con-
stantine was very much in character
and acts the man that Dr. Burch repre-
sents him to be. The author has a real
faculty for penetrating behind the
legends, and has written a very attractive
book. There is something quite indi-

vidual about his style, though some will dislike its preciousity and the use of such expressions as 'equivalisation,' (his own invention?), 'dislocate' (adjective), 'pendulant,' 'corporal' (adjective), 'reminiscential,' 'muting' (=murmuring?), 'overlooked to explain,' 'natively,' and 'beray' (=disfigure, befoul).

Curiously, the great, and even reconcile, learning of the author coexists with numerous inaccuracies. How far the responsibility for these errors has to be shared by the printer (it might be as well to mention that this book was not printed by the Clarendon Press, though it is published by the Oxford University Press) it is difficult to say. But in the last resort the author must accept responsibility, and the responsibility here is so heavy that many will be deterred from giving the book the attention it deserves. The word 'Sabine' is constantly used with reference to 'Soracte,' which was in Etruria, and the author can hardly have realised that Soracte is perfectly visible from the Janiculum, and I should fancy also from the summit of the Capitoline Hill. He speaks as if it were far away from Rome, and is puzzled by its association with the Constantine legends. Other examples of error are: page 21, note 2, 'hominum' for 'hominem,' and 'antiste' for 'antistite'; p. 23, n. 1, 'Laurentianus' for 'Laurentianus'; p. 34, n. 2, 'Socratis calcumine' for 'Soractis cacu-

mine'; n. 3, 'Pothast' for 'Potthast'; p. 37, n. 1, 'Reusen's' for 'Reusens'. In seven lines of Latin on page 47 there are four errors, apart from defective punctuation. At the foot of the same page the erroneous statement occurs: 'the first was in 428, and the second, by the hand of the deacon Grunitus in 430'; this should read 'the first was in 429 (so Mommsen's edition), and the second, along with the deacon Grunitus, by the hand of Aetius in 430,' the Latin being 'Aetius Felicem cum uxore Padusia et Grunito diacono . . . interimit.' On p. 51, the Latin again shows errors; p. 56, n. 2, for 'Codenus' read 'Codinus'; p. 58 read 'gemini' for 'gemina,' and on p. 59 'leuantes' for 'tenentes'; p. 60, n. 1, the first Pliny reference is wrong; on p. 66 'the poet' might have been specified, namely Tibullus II. 5 30; p. 66, n. 2, 'Darembourg' for 'Daremberg'; on p. 67, n. 2, Müller's and Lachmann's editions of Lucilius are quoted, but the author seems never to have heard of the best edition, namely Marx's; in five places (pp. 68 ff.) 'Deubner' appears as 'Dübner'; p. 81, n. 1, correct 'pellices' to 'pulices.' From considerations of space I refrain from detailing many other errors I have noticed. If the author cannot or will not be accurate, he should get a friend or friends to go over all his quotations from other languages, at least in the proof stage.

A. SOUTER.

SCEPTRES, STAVES, AND WANDS.

The Magic Staff or Rod in Graeco-Italian Antiquity. By DR. F. J. M. DE WAELE. Pp. 222; 15 full-page and 1 folding plate. The Hague: J. van der Doesstraat, 1927.

DR. DE WAELE, who writes intelligible, if not very idiomatic, English, wins the reader's goodwill by his modesty and keeps it by his candour. Anyone must, if he attempts such a subject as this, labour more or less under the temptation to twist all his available material into fitting his main theme—in the present case, to prove every stick in ancient art and literature a conjuror's wand. This temptation the author successfully resists, and a

not inconsiderable part of his thesis is taken up with showing that a number of classical staves are that and nothing more; for example, that Asklepios' staff is merely a walking-stick in origin.

He starts with Hermes, whose κηρύκειον he considers to have been originally no more than a forked stick (in shape like a dowser's rod, but wholly divergent therefrom in its nature and use), which, first by having its ends knotted together, and then by successive elaborations of artists, became the complicated emblem of the god generally seen in classical art. It is a kind of sceptre, a badge of authority, because it contains in some manner the

orenda of a king, whether Hermes himself or Zeus. When Hermes conjures he uses a separate implement, a little wand. The historical herald's staff shows a certain confusion of the two ideas of wand and sceptre. Any, or almost any, god may on occasion use some kind of wand (for instance, Athena does so when she gives Odysseus the semblance of a beggar), for every god has *mana*, and this can either originate in the staff or rod or be conducted through it. A good instance of this is the Dionysiac thyrsos, but, for example, Persephone at Lokroi seems to use a little stirring-rod, presumably to give yet more potency to the mystic cup of which she and her worshippers drink.

Among men there are a few cases of a staff worshipped for its own sake, as the 'sceptre of Agamemnon' at Chaireoneia; but this, as de Waele rightly points out, is a survival, and a not very common one, of savage ways. As regards the judge's staff, he is perhaps too ingenious (p. 120; accepting the etymology of *δίκη* from rt. of *δίκειν*, he supposes it to have been originally a blow, real or symbolic, dealt by the judge). Coming to Italy, he talks very sensibly about the lictor's rod, the *festuca* and the *hasta*, whether *Martis* or not, but rather fancifully about C.

Popilius Laenas and his circle (p. 142). In dealing with diviners he is distinctly good; in connexion with witches, he produces (p. 138) the curious fact that whereas Kirke regularly has a wand, Medeia as regularly has not.

Since he definitely asks for mistakes and omissions to be pointed out, I note a few: I do not think there are many. P. 60, if the reference to Aeschylus signifies that the cult of Zeus Agamemnon was known in his time, the evidence we have goes back no farther than Lykophron. P. 145, an Italian augur normally faced south or east, not north, and I know of no evidence that he observed only such birds as flew east or west. On the same page: Teiresias was blinded by Hera or Athena, not Zeus; p. 175, n. 7, by 'Gaelic stick' he means the Highland 'fiery cross'; p. 182, does not Pindar, *Isth.* III. 55, mean that Homer measured the greatness of Aias' worth with the measuring-rod of his verse (*πᾶσαν ὁρθώσας ἀρτάν κατὰ ράβδον ἔφρασεν θεοπεσίων ἐπέων*)? Pp. 176-7, he has been misled by Festus, who confuses the *hasta caelibaris*, with which the bride's hair was parted, with the spear from a gladiator's body, used in other, and obviously later, magic. Pp. 203 and 211, he is inconsistent with himself regarding the etymology of *delubrum*.

H. J. ROSE.

ETRUSCAN ART.

Arte Etrusca. PERICLE DUCATI and GIULIO Q. GIGLIOLI. Pp. 104; 156 half-tone illustrations. Rome: Società Editrice d'Arte Illustrata. 80 lire.

THIS book contains a brief introduction, a list of painted tombs, a good bibliography, and a text in four sections in which Professor Giglioli deals with architecture and sculpture, Professor Ducati with painting and *Kleinkunst*. Both writers have used the limited space at their disposal well, and the first three sections at least present a readable but not merely popular account of their respective themes. The fourth covers most of a very wide field in a businesslike way, but is necessarily rather more austere.

The fundamental problem of Etruscan

Art—its relation to that of Greece—is nowhere discussed at length. Professor Giglioli underlines the non-Greek element in Etruscan sculpture; Professor Ducati is content to point out Greek derivation here and there without drawing any general conclusions. And this omission is to some extent facilitated by the choice of plates, for these do something less than justice to the small bronzes and altogether omit the engraved gems; and it is probably in these two minor arts that the problem now presents itself in the acutest form, and the Etruscans come into closest and most successful rivalry with the Greeks.

Apart from these omissions the book is a good introduction to its subject. The plates might perhaps have drawn

more widely upon Museums outside Italy, but the objects are excellently chosen and the reproductions in general satisfactory. The resulting display is impressive, nor will anyone who examines it readily accept the disparaging accounts of the Etruscans which he

may read in too many other books (e.g. *Camb. Anc. Hist.* Vol. V.) But the picture must be completed by a visit to some of the Etruscan hill-towns—to Cortona, for example, or Volterra, or, perhaps most exquisite of all, the windy upland of Corneto.

A. S. F. Gow.

SOME CLASS-BOOKS.

A First Latin Poetry Book, from Lucretius to Boethius. Selected and edited by J. E. JAMES. Pp. 88. Bell. 2s.

THE editor provides an attractive selection (forty-nine pieces from eighteen poets, thirty-one pages of text) and, in a short space, gives much interesting information about the authors and their works. The book is meant for the School Certificate standard, and most of the pieces are comparatively easy. They are, however, not free from difficulties which will puzzle the inexperienced reader, and I think the editor would have done well to give a little more help. There are, e.g., no notes on *Georg.* IV. 485-527, except that the story of Orpheus is told in part. I mention this passage because many readers of C.R. will know that when set as an 'unseen' at a more advanced stage it is not found easy. But a few hints would enable an intelligent boy to get a great deal of the sense for himself, especially if the Vocabulary were more nearly complete. He will look in vain for *lex*, *foedus*, *lumen*, *somnus*, and under *condo* and *diversus* he will not find the meaning required in this passage. What is he to make of 'conditque natantia lumina somnus,' if he does not know that 'lumina' means 'eyes' and is told that 'condit' means 'hides'? I think that many teachers would like the book better if it gave more poetry and no Vocabulary.

Selections from Virgil, with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary. By J. C. ROBERTSON, J. S. BENNETT, and D. A. GLASSEY. Pp. 231. Harrap. 2s. 6d.

THIS is an excellent book for those who are reading Latin poetry for the first time. Such readers naturally find great difficulties with the language, and

they proceed so slowly that they may easily lose interest even in the tale of Troy. But here they will read the story of the first half of the *Aeneid* well told in English prose (varied from time to time by well-chosen pieces of verse translation). In the course of this narrative they will find in their proper context and setting the passages which are to be read in Latin. Hence, however slowly they proceed, they will regard each Latin passage as part of an interesting story. And with a little practice they should be able to read at a moderate pace. The Vocabulary is carefully constructed, and the Notes give the right sort of help. There is a substantial amount of reading, 1100 lines from the *Aeneid* and 230 from the *Georgics*. The editors are evidently good teachers, much interested in Virgil.

Latin Lessons for Beginners. By J. C. ROBERTSON and A. CARRUTHERS. Pp. 462. Harrap. 3s. 6d.

In this revised edition of their book the authors have cut down the exercises and increased the quantity of continuous reading. In spite of what they say in the Preface, I think that this is a mistake. A considerable amount of new material is introduced in each lesson; my experience is that most pupils need much more practice, especially in turning English into Latin; otherwise they do not get a thorough hold on the new words, forms, and constructions, but have to be continually looking them up. In other respects the book seems to me excellent: it is well arranged, the explanations are clear, the reading lessons and exercises are the work of practised hands. Now and then one comes across a questionable statement: e.g., 'There is no future infinitive passive in common use in Latin.' As a matter of fact,

the form in *-um iri* occurs some sixty times in Cicero, five times in Cæsar. The student is sure to meet it in his reading and should be prepared for it. The pictures are well chosen. The more important among them are carefully described at the beginning of the book and so made far more interesting and instructive. It would be well to state on p. 125 that the restoration of the Forum represents it as it was about A.D. 300. It is given among some stories of early Rome, and I fear that many readers will get the impression that Rome was a city of marble in the days of the Tarquins.

First Latin Lessons. By C. A. PARSONS and C. E. LITTLE. Boston: Heath. 3s. 6d.

THE authors of this book are evidently most earnest in their desire to improve the teaching of Latin. They talk of presenting the language 'not in its merely formal structure, but as a real medium for the expression of thought,' and of bringing about 'a contact in thought and understanding between the pupils of today and the Romans of long ago.' But unfortunately they have not the necessary knowledge of the life and language of the Romans. We read, for instance, of a consul who has a villa somewhere in Italy with a forest near it in which he hunts lions! Here are a few specimens of the language: 'homines et feminae'; 'vir servum diligentia (on account of his diligence) laudat.' This strange use of the ablative is often repeated and perhaps explains the puzzling sentence 'Porsena virtute magna puellae honorem et salutem dedit.' One might suppose that 'Nos qui in America habitamus sunt Americani' was a mere slip of the pen, but the blunder is repeated in the next sentence.

Livy. Book II., Chapters 27 to 47. Edited by M. KEAN. Bell. 2s.

THIS is not a satisfactory edition. The Vocabulary often does not give the meaning required by the text; hence the reader will constantly be baffled in his efforts to make sense, and will probably conclude that it is not worth while to try. How, for instance, can

he make out 'dulcedo legis subibat animos' if *subeo* always means 'undergo'? or 'ad bella externa prope supererant vires' if *supersum* can only mean 'survive'? The Notes give too much help with what is easy, too little with what is hard. Consider e.g. 38. 4: 'Quod, si intersimus spectaculo, violaturi simus ludos piaculumque merituri, ideo nos ab sede piorum coetu concilioque abigi?' Many young readers will fail to see that all this depends on *existimasse* in the previous sentence, and that *ideo* is the 'antecedent' to *quod*. But if one gives the direct form in different order (*ideo Volsci . . . abiguntur, quod . . . violaturi sunt*) they should be able to make it out. The editor merely translates *piaculum merituri*, 'would we deserve to pay an atonement offering.' Far from helping, this seems to show that he has misunderstood the sentence.

Virgil's *Aeneid*. Book II. Adapted for the use of beginners, interspersed with English translations by O. G. E. MCWILLIAM. Macmillan. 2s.

MR. MCWILLIAM'S aims are excellent. He wants to enable young boys at Preparatory Schools to read Virgil with some appreciation, and he wants to teach them how to prepare a translation lesson in an intelligent way. He gives them *Aeneid* II. partly in English, partly in Latin. The Latin pieces, the average length of which is about four lines, are chosen because, the context being clear, they are comparatively easy to construe. In the 'Aids' he gives just so much information as in his opinion the boys will need. They are required to make out the Latin without further help. (There is a Vocabulary, but teachers who believe in the method are to forbid its use.) The book certainly has merits. The boys get on with the story at a satisfactory pace. Each Latin piece presents a little problem which by the use of their wits many of them will be able to solve. But there are two objections to the method: (1) If the boys do not know (as will often happen) the words which the editor thinks they ought to know, they will not be able to make the piece out; (2)—a more serious objection—the poem suffers much by being cut up into

such little bits. Would it not be better to use for this sort of training easy pieces of Ovid and then read *Aeneid* II. as a whole? It is surprising that the metre is not explained and quantities are not marked even in the Vocabulary.

P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon Liber XII. Edited by R. S. LANG. Pp. xxviii + 114. Clarendon Press. 4s. 6d. net.

MR. LANG has found in this book a congenial subject. 'Mythology,' he says, 'like all fruits of the human mind, is a study both fascinating and profitable. The "digressions" (if they are digressions) will not have been written in vain if any pupils are led to the study of the standard works or if they realise that similar problems confront peoples in different lands and often receive similar solutions.' These 'digressions' are necessarily of considerable length, but they are very well written and many boys and girls will study the notes on the legends, the suggestions

of modern parallels, etc., with great interest. The editor has used the best books, including the editions of Korn and Ehwald (1916) and of Magnus (1919). He discusses all difficulties fully and gives throughout much scholarly help. The Vocabulary is well made. A good edition for slow and careful study.

Attic Life: Scenes from the Court Speeches of Demosthenes. Selected and edited by C. W. BATY. Pp. xviii + 79. Christophs. 3s. 6d.

THIS book provides interesting reading for a fifth or sixth form. It contains passages from seventeen different speeches, selected to illustrate Greek life in the fourth century. Mr. Baty has chosen his pieces well; he has added to each of them a short introduction, and brief notes at the foot of the page. There are many small misprints, but they will not seriously hamper the reader.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

Euripides Ion, erklärt von U. v. WILAMOWITZ-MÖELLENDORFF. Berlin: Weidmann, 1926. THIS book is slight but welcome. It is based on lectures, and we envy the audience. Diligent they were, says Wilamowitz, and diligent they must have been to follow at the outset the elaborate reconstruction of the Xuthus-Ion myth. After that the road becomes easier. Readers as well as listeners will be delighted at the master's zest for poetry; his gallant insistence, in the teeth of pedants, that the play's a play, no more, no less; his wayward humour; his knack of treating even grammar as a gay adventure; his pregnant allusiveness, and perhaps most of all—for the spirit of such youth is contagious—his high oracular hints of long accumulated erudition, held in reserve, but ready to be launched against us if we doubt his word—all 'so natürlich dass nur Stumpfsinn Anstoss nimmt.' On the *Hauptsache*, the poet's dramatic art, the character-drawing, the manipulation of plot, he is admirable. His account of 'Verrall the Rationalist' is, I am glad to see, appreciative: the fact that a man of genius went so far astray shows, as he says, that the play needed reinterpretation. His own view, that there are signs of hasty workmanship and of a contradiction in the poet's mind, is sound. Euripides is here a man of the theatre, exploiting with obvious relish and without pedantry a story rich in human pathos and romance, not the less valuable in his eyes because it gives abundant opportunity for propaganda, patriotic and anti-Delphic.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

Hippocrates. With an English translation by Dr. E. T. WITHERINGTON. Vol. III. (Loeb Classical Library.) Heinemann. Price 10s. and 12s. 6d.

THE third volume of the Loeb Hippocrates contains surgical treatises only, edited and translated most appropriately by one who is himself a surgeon. Technically it is of interest chiefly to those who have specialised in surgery; but for the ordinary scholar it has a more general interest in that it serves to illustrate several points of difference between life in ancient times and life at the present day. In the less violent intercourse of our times the surgeon is concerned not so much, or at least not chiefly, with dislocated joints and cracked skulls, but with diseases whose effects are internal and gradual: he uses the knife, but the ancient surgeon, as the treatises in this volume show, was occupied with the bandage and the splint.

A slight mistake in the Preface needs correction. In the contents of the fourth volume (shortly to be published), instead of *Regimen in Health i-iii*, read *Regimen in Health, Regimen i-iii.*

A. L. PECK.

Modern Traits in Old Greek Life. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) By CHARLES BINTON GULICK. Pp. vii + 159. London, Calcutta, Sydney: Harrap and Co. 5s. net.

THE title of this agreeable, if not very exciting, little essay, is perhaps misleading. The 'modern traits' amount to little more than the recognition that the Greeks were a people of flesh and blood who lived a civilised life, and that their civilisation in fact stands in a very

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

real historical and spiritual relation to our own. Some lip-service is paid to the title, as when we are invited to notice that Timotheus, like the favourites of modern concert halls, enjoyed displaying his jewelry, and there are some concessions to the modern Greek's natural pride in his racial ancestry. But in substance the book briefly and sensibly reviews the conditions of daily life in ancient Greece under such headings as 'the dwelling, furniture, apparel, food, education, commerce,' and so on. It is written by a competent scholar who knows the facts. It was a pity to spell his name incorrectly on the back of the cover.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

Plato with an English Translation. (Loeb Classical Library.) III.: *The Statesman, Philebus.* By HAROLD N. FOWLER, Ph.D. *Ion.* By W. R. M. LAMB, M.A. Pp. xx + 450.

London : Heinemann 1925. Cloth, 10s.

MR. FOWLER'S translation is in about as good English as the style of his originals deserves, and appears to me to be generally accurate, though mistakes occur (e.g., *Polit.* 260B, *ἀγαπητὸν* 'pleasant'; 289B, *εἰ τι μῆ* confused with *εἰ μῆ τι*; 293A, *ἡτινοι* confused with *tuta*; 299C, *ἐπιτίθεσθαι κτλ.*, 'to attack the arts of navigation in opposition to the laws'). He undertakes to note any readings adopted that are not in either B or T, and, so far as my observation goes, he does so. Whose collations he has used he does not say. Misprints are rare, but the orthography is antiquated.

W. L. LORIMER.

Plato with an English Translation. VI : *Cratylus, Parmenides, Greater Hippias, Lesser Hippias.* By H. N. FOWLER. Pp. viii + 480. W. Heinemann (Loeb), 1926.

MR. FOWLER has produced a translation of these four dialogues that should prove useful for cursory and rapid reading. Some of the footnotes suggest that the translation is intended to be of service to those whose acquaintance with Greek is slight. The needs of this class of reader have been, on the whole, adequately met.

In the case of the *Parmenides* the translation would have been more useful if either a brief explanation of the term *ἰδέα* had been given, or the translation of that term by 'idea' had been avoided. A reader of the *Parmenides*, even though ignorant of Platonic thought, would find no insuperable difficulty in following the argument, provided that the term *ἰδέα* were explained to him. The translation 'idea' would merely mystify him.

A brief introduction precedes each of the dialogues, setting forth its main purpose, with notes on the characters introduced, date, and, in the case of the two *Hippias* dialogues, authenticity.

Mr. Fowler thinks that the *Greater Hippias* is not the work of Plato, merely on stylistic grounds (p. 334). Against this impression may be set the fact, pointed out by Professor A. E. Taylor, that this dialogue is 'tacitly quoted or alluded to several times in the *Topics*' in such a way as to make it probable that Aristotle

regarded it as a Platonic work (*Plato : The Man and his Work*, pp. 13, 14, where see references).

On the authenticity of the *Lesser Hippias* Mr. Fowler is agnostic. Again, Professor Taylor's observation (*ibid.*, p. 35) seems all but decisive in favour of its Platonic origin. 'Its authenticity is sufficiently established by the fact that Aristotle, though not mentioning the author, quotes the dialogue by name as "the Hippias"; such explicit references never occur in his work to writings of any "Socratic men" other than Plato.'

A few misprints may here be noted. In *Parm.* 129E 8, *εἰδεῖ* should be *εἰδεῖ*. On p. 219, B is wrongly reported as reading *ἀνάγκη ἦ*. It gives *ἀνάγκη ἦ*. *Ibid.*, 138A 9, *bv* after *περιέχουν* is a mere 'dittograph.'

H. BOX.

Plato with an English Translation. X : *Laws.* By R. G. BURY, Litt.D. In two volumes. II. Pp. 582. W. Heinemann (Loeb), 1926.

IT is unfortunate that this volume does not contain the *Epinomis*, which follows logically the twelfth book of the *Laws* and should be read in conjunction with it. The addition of this work, while not inconveniently increasing the bulk of the book, would have enhanced its usefulness.

It is difficult to understand why the edition of Baiter, Orelli and Winckelmann (1839) is chosen as the basis of the text. Those scholars made no advance on the work of Bekker and Stallaum. But Mr. Bury incorporates in his text much recent critical work, including his own additions and emendations.

Some of the readings that deviate from the MS. traditions are not completely convincing. For example :

802E 6. *τὰ δὲ τῶν θηλεῖων* is transposed from before *ἄντῳ* to after *διαφέροντι*. England points out (*Plato : The Laws*, ii., p. 268) that A really reads *ἀνάγκη* and not *ἀνάγκη* in 802E 5, as Burnet discovered, and that this fact 'puts out of court all emendations . . . which assume the reading *ἀνάγκη*'. The expression *ἄντῳ τῷ τῆς φύσεως ἐκατέρου διαφέροντι* cannot, then, be dependent on *κατεχόμενα* in 802E 6, as the translation of Mr. Bury takes it.

819B 3. *διανομᾶς* Wilamowitz, MSS. read *διανομαῖ*: a needless alteration, *διανομαῖ* agreeing with *μαθήματα* (nominative).

819B 7. *καὶ* bracketed by Wilamowitz : needlessly.

961A 8. *δόξαν τοῦτο* Wilamowitz : MSS. *δόξαν τούτοις*. The MS. reading is not too difficult to stand. Place, with Burnet, a comma after *δόξαν*, which, like *συνλλέγεσθαι* above, depends on *δεῖν*.

965A 7. *κεκτημένους* MSS. : *κεκτημένην* Bury after Wilamowitz. But the MS. reading may agree with *ἥμας* understood (England).

Mr. Bury's own conjectures are not always convincing. Thus, 808D 2, *ἀνον.* The MS. text can stand, and this word, in the sense required ('brute' as opposed to 'rational being'), is doubtful.

814A 2. The addition of *ἄλλου* is not imperative.

The expression *τῷ τάκινητα κινεῖν* (843A 1-2)

is not parallel to 'Let sleeping dogs lie,' as is suggested in the footnote.

In 905A 2 ἀρχῆς is rendered 'luckless wight,' a meaning which, in the context, is pointless. It is better with Apelt to take the word in the sense of ἀμοινή, 'not participating in' (Apelt, *Platons Gesetze*, ii., p. 540, n. 77), a sense found in Aelian, *H.A.* 11 : 31, σοφίας οὐκ ἀρχεῖ (quoted by L. and S. s.v. ἀρχῆς). ταῦτης τῆς δίκης would then depend on ἀρχῆς and not on περιγενέσθαι. H. BOX.

Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg. Herausgegeben von FRITZ SAXL. Vorträge 1923-1924.

Pp. 277. Leipzig, Berlin : Teubner, 1926. THIS volume of Warburg Lectures is, like its predecessors, full of valuable information and suggestive speculation, and enriched by a large number of excellent and instructive photographic illustrations. In accordance with the general idea of the Warburg foundation, the lectures travel far beyond the ground commonly covered by classical students, and in accordance with precedent most of them seem to be much expanded versions of the spoken word. An exception in both respects is Wilamowitz' lecture on 'Zeus,' which gives a concise account of the origin and history of the cult of the god with special reference to the development of the monotheistic idea. Ernst Hoffmann's elaborate study entitled 'Platonismus und Mittelalter' should on no account be missed by Platonists. We are glad to see that he half-promises a more detailed treatment of this material in a separate work. The study is in a sense misnamed, since fully two-thirds of it has no direct reference to the Middle Ages, but represents an attempt to reconstruct the Platonic system out of the evidence afforded by the middle and latter dialogues. It is one of the most interesting accounts of Platonism that we have read for many years. Other essays that will interest readers of the *Classical Review* are—Richard Reitzenstein's on 'Nordic, Persian, and Christian Notions of the End of the World,' Hugo Gressmann's on 'Greek Influence on Oriental Religions,' and Hans Liebeschütz' on 'The Cosmological Ideas of the Early Scholastics.'

J. L. STOCKS.

Ioannes Pediasimus: In Aristotelis Analytica Scholia Selecta. Edidit VICTORIUS DE FALCO. Pp. xxii + 175. Naples : Sangiovanni, 1926.

For the life and times of John Pediasimus, the author of this commentary now published for the first time, Mr. De Falco refers the reader to other works on Byzantine learning. He is content to describe him as 'Bulgaria chartophylax,' and as 'vir valde peritus,' not merely in philosophy but also in mathematics and other subjects. If Jöcher is to be trusted, he was secretary to the patriarch of Constantinople, lived in the eleventh century, and left behind him among other works twelve books on the Labours of Hercules.

Mr. De Falco does not print the whole of the commentary, because Pediasimus, like most late commentators, borrowed heavily from his

predecessors, especially from John Philoponus: passages which are verbally or substantially repeated from commentaries included in the Berlin series are suppressed here. There remains enough to fill 120 pages of Greek text, not a continuous exposition like those of Alexander and his successors, but occasional continuous passages of some length joined by notes on chosen texts, each introduced by a short lemma followed by some such phrase as λογίων ὅτι. The latest passage treated is *Post Anal.* A 75b 13.

It is not likely that Aristotelian scholars will find in these pages any important contribution to the elucidation of the master's doctrine, but the textual evidence supplied is not to be despised, as Mr. De Falco points out in his Preface, and those who do not take an unduly narrow view of their Aristotelian responsibilities will find much else of value and interest in these pages. They will be much assisted by care and skill with which Mr. De Falco has performed his editorial duties and by his excellent indices.

J. L. STOCKS.

Epicurus: His Morals. Collected and faithfully Englished by Walter Charleton, 1651. Reprinted with an Introductory Essay by FREDERIC MANNING. Pp. xlvi + 20 unnumbered + 119. London : Peter Davis, 1926. 15s.

IT was a happy thought of Mr. Manning's to reprint Charleton's *Epicurus' Morals*, for it is a striking record of the interest in Epicurus in English in the seventeenth century, when Epicureanism had been revived by Gassendi, and through him had exercised a profound influence on Charleton's friend Hobbes. Charleton's treatise is founded on the *Letter to Menoeceus* and the *Kύπεια Δόξαι* preserved in the tenth book of Diogenes Laertius, together with free borrowings from Lucretius. But the material so supplied is greatly expanded and elaborated in a characteristic seventeenth-century manner. Links missing in the ancient record are imaginatively supplied, room is found for virtues such as Beneficence and Gratitude, and the hardness of Epicurean egoism is toned down to suit contemporary feelings. Particularly characteristic and amusing is the introductory *Apology for Epicurus* (whose pages, by the way, are unnumbered) in which Charleton defends him for his three 'heresies' of the mortality of the soul, the indifference of the gods, and the legitimacy of suicide, all of which are skilfully glossed and minimised in the treatise itself.

Mr. Manning has added an attractive introduction in which he puts Charleton in the setting of his time and his friends, and writes some comments—all too brief—on the relation of the Epicurean pleasure-theory to other ethical theories of antiquity. The view developed on pp. xl and xli that the key to the understanding of the ηδονή καραστηματική lies in the notion of πράηψις is, I think, new, and certainly valuable.

The book is beautifully got up and will be enjoyed as much by the bibliophile as by the scholar.

CYRIL BAILEY.

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

*Aristidis qui feruntur libri rhetorici II. Edidit
GUILELMUS SCHMID. Pp. xv + 146. Leipzig :
Teubner. M. 6.*

THIS is a new text contributed by the author of *Der Atticismus* to form the fifth volume of the *Rhetores Graeci* published by Teubner. The editor had already, in *Rhein. Mus.*, Vol. LXII. (1918), at some length expressed his views on the questions of authorship, MS. tradition, and the relation of the two treatises to each other and to Hermogenes, and now briefly recapitulates his result in a businesslike Latin preface. It is interesting to note that while preparing the present text he found cause to revise opinions accepted by him in Pauly-Wissowa *R.E.* (1895) and in Christ's *Griech. Lit.-gesch.* II.⁵, and his conclusions based on very skilfully marshalled evidence are briefly these: (1) The two treatises are not by the same author; (2) Aelius Aristides was the author of neither; (3) Treatise II., περὶ τοῦ ἀφελοῦ λόγου, was the work of some adherent of the Stoic philosophy, possibly Zenon, a rhetor of the second century A.D.

The present text of Dr. Schmid is a vast improvement on any that has preceded it, and has been prepared with the most uncommon care. Full use has now been made for the first time of the famous *Paris Codex* (P 1741), which contains the chief works of Greek literary criticism that have come down to us, including Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*, Demetrius' *De Elocutione* and Dionysius Halic. *De Compositione Verborum*. The editor has shown that P 1741 is the archetype of all the extant MSS. of the *rēx̄ia*. A just tribute is paid in the preface to the work of Lars Norrman, Professor of Greek at Uppsala and afterwards Archbishop, who, with only the Aldine edition before him when he produced his text in 1688, in many passages conjecturally restored the right reading, and in many others made suggestions which if not confirmed by P have materially helped to establish the present text. Dindorf's text (Leipzig 1829) is rightly castigated; it is based on the Aldine edition or inferior MSS., and is in many places untranslatable.

But the excellence of the present text is not simply due to the use made of P. The judgment of the editor is shown at every turn, in the improved punctuation and in the emendations which he has either suggested himself or adopted from others, such as Walz, Spengel and Finckh (an admirable example of an emendation by the editor is to be found in I. § 5). There are some cases where the editor may perhaps be thought to have been too cautious in admitting into the text suggestions made by himself or by others (e.g., I. § 139 and § 145). The *Apparatus Criticus* is a model of clearness, and there is appended a complete Index Rheticus which adds greatly to the value of the edition. I have noticed only minor misprints, mostly in the Preface and in the *Apparatus Criticus*.

Perhaps this new text will draw attention to two treatises which have been neglected for the most part in this country. Neither is strictly a *rēx̄ia* ῥητορική, each is more properly a treatise περὶ ιδεῶν, and of importance in

relation to the work of Hermogenes. In particular Treatise II. and Dr. Schmid's view of its authorship will serve to show the high regard in which Xenophon, as the pattern of *ἀρέτη*, was held in many of the rhetorical schools of the Empire and in Stoic circles generally.

E. D. T. JENKINS.

Libanii Opera. Recensuit RICHARDUS FOERSTER. Vol. IX.: Libanii qui feruntur Charactères Epistolici, Prolegomena ad Epistulas. Imp. cur. EBERHARDUS RICHTSTEIG. Pp. 251. Leipzig : Teubner, 1927. Unbound, R.M. 6.20; bound, R.M. 8.

THIS volume, written in 1920, completes the gigantic undertaking of the late Professor Foerster of Breslau in bringing out a critical edition of the works of Libanius. The work occupied him continuously for fifty years, during which time he read through every MS. of this voluminous writer, and it fills more than 6,600 pages. Vols. X. and XI., comprising the Epistles, and Vol. XII., containing an index of proper names, made by Dr. E. Richtsteig, the editor of the present volume, had already appeared. This volume exhibits the meticulous care and amazing wealth of detail with which the readers of the previous volumes are familiar. It contains the spurious ἐπιστολάριον χαρακτῆρες, then the Prolegomena to the Epistles, including (1) an account of the MSS. and editions; (2) a final word on the purpose of the whole edition. Foerster examined more than 250 MSS. which have a bearing on the Corpus of the Epistles, besides 160 more which contain only a few of them. It is interesting to find that he accepts as genuine Libanius' letters to the two bishops, Amphilochius and Optimus, who had been students of his, but rejects the letter to John Chrysostom and the correspondence between Libanius and Basil. Vol. IX. was put in the hands of Richtsteig, a fine scholar, and one of the leading authorities on Libanius, with instructions to make it as brief as possible. This he has done, largely by a judicious system of abbreviations, but nothing essential appears to have been omitted. For his work we have nothing but praise; and Foerster himself (p. 244) gives high commendation to R.'s able treatise, *Libanius qua ratione Platonis operibus usus sit* (Breslau, 1918).

G. MIDDLETON.

Über den Sprachgebrauch des Longus. Inaugural-Dissertation von GUNNAR VALLEY. Pp. vii + 110. Uppsala : Edv. Berlings Nya Boktryckeri A.-B., 1926.

THIS useful dissertation opens with a brief discussion of some of the MSS. The author claims that his investigation of A in photograph has enabled him definitely to decide many disputed readings and tends to rehabilitate the shaken authority of Courier. B, he suggests very plausibly, is not a lost MS., an ancestor of the Ursiniani, but itself one of the Ursiniani—Vat. 1348.

Turning to linguistic questions, both in forms of words and in syntax Mr. Valley would allow Longus much greater freedom than has been

allowed by editors. He contends (rightly, if MS. authority means anything) that late Greek authors used alternative forms indiscriminately (*e.g.* γίγνομαι, γίνομαι; κλάω, κλαίω; -σσ-, -ττ.; augmented and unaugmented pluperfects) and that it is wrong to try to force uniformity upon them. In defence of syntactical abnormalities he offers imposing lists of parallels, but the uncertainty of the text of some of the writers to whose authority he points makes some of his generalisations hazardous. The reviewer, for instance, who is acquainted with the MSS. of Heliodorus, cannot accept Heliod. 5. 33 (cited p. 40) as an example of οὐτε=ne . . . quidem; for the best MSS. give οὐδέ. The same applies to 4. 1 (p. 38²). But the unsoundness of some of his examples does not invalidate his main thesis that Longus must be allowed considerable laxity. In vocabulary he demonstrates that Longus uses many late words (against Rohde) and few poetic words (against Schmid), and that Ionic words are common.

The last chapter is devoted to the popular but rather useless task of finding parallel passages in earlier authors and making the doubtful deduction that they must have influenced Longus. Mr. Valley prides himself on new discoveries, but their value is questionable. The linguistic part of his book, however, will be indispensable to future editors.

R. M. RATTEBURY.

Fitzwilliam Museum: Catalogue of the McClean Greek Coins. By S. W. GROSE. Vol. II. Greek Mainland, Aegean Islands, Crete. Pp. 563; 248 collotype plates. Cambridge: University Press. £5 5s.

MR. GROSE is to be congratulated on the rapidity with which he is completing his monumental catalogue of the McClean collection. The first volume, containing three thousand odd coins of Italy and Sicily, appeared in 1923; the second contains nearly two and a half times as many, and carries us as far as the Cyclades; and the third, which is well under way, will presumably complete the catalogue. This is not the place for such few detailed criticisms on numismatic points as might be made. Mr. Grose follows in general the established lines of classification, and only deviates from them where a more recent attribution—for instance, that of the early 'heraldic' coins to Athens—has been generally accepted. The descriptive work is thoroughly sound, and eight indexes are provided covering every conceivable point on which classified information might be required. The present volume is not so important as the previous one, in that the various series which it describes are not nearly so full as were those of Magna Graecia and Sicily, on which the late Mr. J. R. McClean had lavished special care. All the same, it provides a valuable mass of material, among which may be mentioned the fine series of so-called *Aes Grave* of Olbia, of fifth-century staters of Melos from the find made some twenty years since, and of Cretan coins.

It is earnestly to be hoped that some benefactor will now come forward to publish the Leake coins which unite with the McClean to place

the Cambridge Cabinet in the front rank of public collections.

E. S. G. ROBINSON.

Campaigns in Palestine from Alexander the Great. By ISRAEL ABRAHAMS. Schweich Lectures, 1922. Pp. x+55, one plate and a map. London: Oxford University Press, 1927. 5s.

THESE three lectures are a tribute paid by a great Jewish scholar, the late Dr. Abrahams, to Palestine as the battle-ground of nations; they are edited by Mr. S. A. Cook, who contributes an appreciative notice of the author. The third lecture ranges discursively from Titus to Allenby. The first two possess a unity in the figures of Alexander and Judas Maccabaeus, though they do not advance our knowledge much where they deal with Hellenistic matters, of which the author's view is too often the old conventional one. He holds that Judas' campaigns saved Judaism; but it is so certain that the Seleucids, but for their own dissensions, could have reduced Judaea whenever they chose to give their mind to it, that the author's position needs an explanation it never gets, though he does suggest the importance of the *passive* resistance. Neither does he attempt any real explanation of why Antiochus IV. acted as he did; and Alexander's alleged visit to Jerusalem is discussed at length and accepted without mention, *e.g.*, of the fact that Theophrastus, who reproduced the knowledge acquired by Alexander's expedition, thought the Jews were star-gazers who had invented human sacrifice—a fact which by itself suffices to render it impossible. But as lectures they are quite interesting, and often contain shrewd observations, as on the topography of Judas' campaigns and the meaning of the term 'little horn.'

W. W. TARN.

Recherches sur la Chancellerie et la Diplomatique des Lagides. By PAUL COLLOMP. Pp. viii+245. 'Les Belles Lettres,' Paris, and Oxford University Press, 1926. 9s.

THIS study of the *entœuxis* or petition is a good book, careful and thorough. Professor Collomp lists, analyses, and examines the formulae of all the known *entœuxis*, including numerous unpublished documents from Magdöla, and his patient minuteness ultimately elicits some interesting historical conclusions. In the third century, petitions addressed to Ptolemy were usually dealt with by the generals of the nomes, but did sometimes reach the king himself. By the second century, many matters were addressed directly to the generals, but they could no longer handle petitions addressed to Ptolemy; these, however, only reached, never the king himself, but two officials, the *epistolographos* for those that came as letters, the *hyponnematographos* for those presented personally; neither official can be traced in the third century, though Collomp reserves the question whether they existed. Ptolemy, then, had become theoretically more but practically less accessible to his subjects, while the Greek generals were no longer his delegates; naturally one says 'Raphia,' and in fact the author by

the aid of P. Frankfort⁷ dates the change to that time. Other points well brought out are the extreme rarity of the use of *ἀδικία* in complaints against officials—the king's bureaucracy can do no wrong; the formulae which address the king as a good little Providence, where Collomp fruitfully suggests as the interpretation of certain royal utterances that perhaps the Ptolemies, through everlasting hearing that they protected the weak and dispensed justice, really came to believe it; and the common allusion to Ptolemaic world-rule, that worn-out relic of the old religion. Petitions everywhere inevitably follow certain lines (as the Ptolemaic are here shown rooted in Athenian forms); and a hope that Ptolemy may rule the *oecumene* means exactly what an English petition now means by its concluding formula, 'And your petitioner will ever pray etc.'—that is, just nothing at all. Those obsessed by ideas of Macedonian world-rule, Ptolemaic or other, might study the *enteuxes* and their bearing on the matter. The book has four indices and a *table analytique*.

W. W. TARN.

into which Seleucid Syria broke up, the title *Ιερὰ καὶ δῶντος* needed thorough discussion. But naturally every reader will find among this mass of details things he does not accept. It is more important to emphasise the amount of new light thrown on provincial boundaries everywhere and the many problems solved—e.g. Coele-Syria was the name of the Ptolemaic province, and Parapotamia is correctly located (as independently by Cumont, *Fouilles de Doura-Europos*, p. xxv). Above all, for the first time Hellenistic Syria emerges from the shadows and begins to take shape. W. W. TARN.

Historia Alexandri Magni (Pseudo-Callisthenes). Recensio Vetusta. Ed. GUL. KROLL. Pp. xvi + 166. Berlin : Weidmann, 1926. M. 9.

THIS book is an edition, with critical apparatus, of the text of the oldest Greek version of *Pseudo-Callisthenes*, that called A'; another volume, to be edited by J. Kroll, will contain B' and C'. It is eighty years since Müller edited *Pseudo-Callisthenes* in the Didot Arrian; much material has come to light since, and W. Kroll's edition will henceforth be the standard text of A'. He has collated afresh the difficult MS. on which A' depends; and in the preface, a model of concise information, he considers the relationships of the various versions which help towards the reconstruction of the text, and explains the use he has made of them. Among other things, he attaches little importance to the once praised Leyden MS., and holds that much the most important aid to the restoration of A' is the fifth-century Armenian version, especially where it and Valerius agree. He defends his view that the account of the poisoning of Alexander in the *History* comes from the Metz *Epitome*, and not *vice versa* as Ausfeld and Wilcken argued; and as the account of Alexander's death is missing from A', he has inserted in his text (in Greek) an account based on that one of the two Armenian accounts which agrees with Valerius in knowing nothing of the poisoning; the oldest Greek text is thus freed from Olympias' propaganda story that her son was poisoned by Antipater's son, which is interesting. On the genesis of the *History*, Kroll restates the difference between himself and Ausfeld : he believes it only took shape c. 300 A.D., though it contains older material inserted; Ausfeld thought of a Hellenistic nucleus. The book seems an excellent piece of work, and a good text in handy form is welcome. There is a useful index of unusual words and phrases, beside one of proper names.

W. W. TARN.

Syrische Territorien in hellenistischer Zeit. By U. KAHRSTEDT. Pp. 156; 6 maps on 3 sheets. Berlin : Weidmann, 1926. M. 18. THIS book breaks much new ground, and forms a valuable contribution to knowledge. The subjects treated—there is, unfortunately, no list of chapters—are the satrapies before Seleucus, the changes of boundary in the Syrian wars, Syria under the Ptolemies and Seleucids respectively, the boundaries of the Judaean state, the break up of Seleucid rule in Syria, and the Roman reorganisation. An appendix seeks to establish that from 166, perhaps to 153, the Maccabees used a national Jewish year, beginning in spring and not (as the Syrian Seleucid year) in autumn; a second appendix argues that the bulk of the Egyptian Jews followed the 'schism of Onias' and looked to Leontopolis. Over the Syrian wars I feel two difficulties. One is Kahrstedt's contention that till 198 the important Damascus was normally Ptolemaic; for though evidence hardly exists, still, if Damascus first became (temporarily) Seleucid in 275, how is the loss to Egypt of such a city compatible with that conception of a highly successful war which underlies Callimachus, Theocritus, and Arsinoe's honours? The other is Kahrstedt's belief that in 301 Seleucus only got what was afterwards the North Syrian *tetrapolis*. Now Strabo shows that at some time the Eleutherus must have divided Phoenicia, which in Kahrstedt's scheme it never does; and after his careful analysis there is only one place for it, 301-273. The old view, then, is probably still correct : Seleucus in 301 got Aradus and Damascus and whatever they entailed. Other difficulties which struck me are the defects in the attempted proof that after 198 all Ptolemaic Syria became one Seleucid generalship, and the complete failure of the evidence cited (p. 42) for Judaea as an administrative unit under the Ptolemies (it was a priest-state under Egyptian suzerainty); while in the best chapter in the book, the full and fresh account of the fragments

Arrien : L'Inde. Texte établi et traduit par PIERRE CHANTRAIN. Pp. 92. Paris : 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1927.

A NEW and handy *Ινδική* was seriously needed, and M. Chantraine's is welcome, though his commentary has shortcomings : the Budé scheme of notes under the translation allows too little scope, at least without appendices. The preface does not estimate Nearchus' place in geographical discovery, as do Grote and

Bunbury : it goes with this that Scylax is mentioned, but no position taken (unless by omission ?) towards the alleged Indus-Red-Sea voyage of Hdt. IV. 44. One expects also some reference to Pliny's *nec nomina habet manionum nec spatia*.

Arrian's treatise, in an artificial Ionic which troubles editors, falls into two dissimilar parts. For cc. 1-17, the general account of India, the notes would have gained greatly from Bevan's chapters in the *Cambridge Hist. of India*, I. (1922), which is never mentioned. For Part II., the voyage, Tomaschek's identifications should have been explained and justified (cf. Herzfeld's criticisms in *Klio*, 1908, 7) : anyhow the Arabis should not be one river (Hab) in the notes and another (Purali) on the map. Makran is remote, but more recent English accounts than Kempthorne's were available. The old and the new (island) Hormuz are not distinguished, and one notes other obscurities. The last chapter is uncertainly handled : see now Tarn in *C.R.* 1926, 13.

The map, which might have shown also Alexander's march, has no modern names and is too sketchy. There is a useful index.

J. O. THOMSON.

Le Péripole de la Mer Érythrée, suivi d'une Étude sur la Tradition et la Langue. By HJALMAR FRISK. Pp. 145. Gothenburg : Wettergren and Kerber, 1927. 8 kron.

MR. FRISK intended at first only a special study of his author's linguistic usage. This is now represented by some sixty pages forming a useful treatise on the Koine. The existing editions, of which Fabricius' is very severely criticised, soon proved quite unreliable for his purpose, whatever their merits for the matter, and he went himself to the famous Heidelberg MS. His scientific recension, admirably printed, will be indispensable for a text which has suffered much from arbitrary rewriting. Mr. Frisk abstains from discussion of the interesting historical and geographical matter, but for Mommsen's view (*Röm. Gesch.* V. 611) of Roman dealings with Aden it may be noted that, like Rostovtzeff, Kornemann, and Schur, he has no doubt in 26 of *Kαίσαραν αὐτῆν κατεστρέψατο*.

J. O. THOMSON.

Logios. By EMIL ORTH. Pp. iv + 108. Leipzig : Robert Noske. M. 9.

This book consists of a collection, with brief notes, of all passages in which occur the words λόγιος and λογίτης (but not λόγων). The sum of the author's conclusions is that λόγιος, probably Ionic by origin, does not appear in any true Attic author, nor in any poet but Pindar before the Christian era. From then on it is common in two meanings—(a) erudite, well educated ; (b) brilliant in style, eloquent. At times the author seems somewhat arbitrary, occasionally even wrong-headed, in deciding which meaning to assign to the word in a particular passage. For example, when Strabo says that Theophrastus received his name because of his φράστεως ζῆλον, 'ἀπαντας μὲν γὰρ λογίους ἐποίησε τοὺς μαθητὰς Ἀριστοτελῆς, λογιώ-

ταρούς δὲ Θεόφραστον,' the meaning must be that he was the greatest stylist, not the greatest scholar (p. 37). Indeed, on another page (p. 35) this passage is referred to in a context which assumes this 'rhetorical' meaning.

In general, one cannot help feeling that Dr. Orth has been unfortunate in choosing for his study a word which has hardly repaid the labour he has evidently devoted to it.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt editio U. P. BOISSEVAIN. Volumen IV. Index historicus. Pp. 706. Berlin : Weidmann, 1926. Paper, 42 M.
Dionysi Halicarnasensis Antiquitatum Romanarum quae supersunt editio C. JACOBY. Supplementum indices continens. Pp. iv + 69. Leipzig : Teubner, 1925. Cloth, 3 M.

AFTER twenty-five and twenty years two valuable texts have been rounded off. Jacoby's index is compact and good ; Boissevain's is very copious, yet so well arranged as to answer to every need without waste of time.

E. HARRISON.

Greek Fictile Revetments in the Archaic Period. By E. DOUGLAS VAN BUREN. Pp. xx+ 208. 39 plates. London : John Murray, 1926. 24s. net.

MRS. VAN BUREN, who has previously earned the gratitude of archaeologists by her books on Italian architectural terra-cottas, has now turned her attention to Greece, with the good results here well presented. Greek architectural terra-cottas of the archaic period are illustrated by one coloured and thirty-eight half-tone plates, and there is a brief account of each of the sites whence they come, a catalogue of all the pieces concerned, and a comparative table. It is extremely useful to have this Greek material, mostly unpublished and scattered up and down Greece, made available for further study. Except for Olympia and Thermos too little attention has been paid to this class of object which for the archaic period is extremely interesting, both from the artistic point of view in the development of Greek ornament and from the architectural for the better understanding of the use of wood and terra-cotta in the construction of early buildings.

Some of the finest pieces are those from Korope and the Acropolis, while the Bassae disc, to judge by its fragments, must have been most effective when *in situ* on the roof of a temple. The Thermos pieces might have been more fully discussed with the metopes, especially from an architectural point of view ; in any case, however, the antefixes with the Satyrs and male and female heads are as good as any of their kind. This is a field which deserves further study. The important remains from other sites, e.g. Corinth, which here whet our appetite, we should like to see exhaustively treated, and we much hope Mrs. Van Buren will be encouraged to continue her work. We note some points which might be improved—measurements of the pieces in the catalogue and the scale of illustrations should be given. The spelling of

names like *kymation* or *akroterion* should all be made uniform, either Latinised completely or left in their Greek dress. Greek place-names, ancient and modern, have cost the author a good many mistakes—for instance, Homolion (not Homilion) is not in South but in North Magnesia, near Tempe. Some scheme should be devised to make the numbers in the catalogue, in the comparative table, and on the plates agree with one another, as it would facilitate reference and prevent bad temper from diminishing our gratitude to the author.

A. J. B. WACE.

Terence en France au XVI^e Siècle. Editions et Traductions par HAROLD WALTER LAWTON. Pp. 570. Paris: Jouve et C^{ie}, 1926. 8s. 6d.

P. J. H. MÜLLER: *De Veterum Grammaticorum in Terentio Studiis Criticis.* Aachen: Ex typographia 'Buco,' 1926.

REGARDING Terence as an important factor in the history of Humanism in France, Dr. Lawton sets out to ascertain all that is known about French editions and translations of 'the African' during the sixteenth century. But with commendable thoroughness (and an almost pre-bellum disregard of space) he feels bound to enumerate every edition published in Western Europe from 1470 (*editio princeps*) to 1600. An introductory chapter summarises the evidence for knowledge and appreciation of Terence roughly between the Augustan Age and the invention of printing. Here Dr. Lawton has not always used the latest authorities. He might modify or supplement some of his statements. For instance, the MS. v (of Valenciennes) belongs to the eleventh century. A second introductory chapter deals convincingly with the characteristics of Terence which commended him to sixteenth-century France. French translators (sixteenth century) of Terence, their differences, their defects, their progressive mastery of the matter (Dr. Lawton gives an exhaustive account of the commentaries at their disposal) and the manner of Terence, are described in an admirable concluding section. Throughout the author keeps in view the general question of Terence's popularity in France, for he promises a companion volume treating specifically of Terence's influence on French literature, especially Comedy, and this first volume gives the *a priori* evidence. Students of Terence welcome the first instalment of what will be a handsome contribution to the history of the modern European mind as a derivative of the Graeco-Roman. Some misprints are not in the list of errata. On p. 304, l. 1, for 'Asperus' read 'Asper'; p. 49, l. 23, for 'des cena dubia' read 'd'une c. d.' A detailed index of persons is desirable.

Dr. Müller attacks a problem of first-rate importance for editors of Terence's text. That text, as we have it in the minuscule MSS. (and even in the *Codex Beobinus*), has been largely tampered with. Substitute words, forms, tenses, etc., appear frequently in the MSS., some or all. Given the true Terentian reading, one may guess the nature of a substitute; not

seldom one is at a loss to explain the motive for change. Assume that Terence has been edited as a school-book and you can label substitutions as 'classical construction,' 'regular form,' etc. But a large element of uncertainty remains. Dr. Müller takes the very reasonable course of interrogating the Latin grammarians on points of correct Latinity and deviations therefrom. From them, if at all, precise answers must come. He ransacks their pages, and under their headings classifies and explains a host of substitute readings. There is a danger (he is aware) that grammarians' rules may be called in to explain what are merely scribal errors or scribal caprice. Sometimes one feels that he is too 'methodical.' He has had to rely on Umpfenbach's *apparatus criticus*, which is now superseded by Kauer's invaluable collation of Terence MSS. The attribution of readings to such-and-such groups of MSS. must therefore be carefully checked. One point more: Donatus' *lemmata* should not now be given the weight of readings known to, or approved by, Donatus. With these cautions, however, Dr. Müller's dissertation can be recommended as the most thorough and illuminating treatise on this important side of the critical study of the text.

J. D. CRAIG.

Seneca, Phaedra, herausgegeben und erläutert von DR. K. KUNST, A. Ö. Prof. der klass. Philologie an der Univ. Wien. Two vols. Text, pp. 66; commentary, pp. 88. Wien: Österreichischer Schulbücherverlag, 1924.

EDITIONS of Senecan plays are becoming quite frequent; one may hope that the severest critics of Senecan drama will some day brace their nerves and even read it. This edition is intended for schools and Universities. It contains a good account of Seneca's life and works, taking cognisance of their relation to their Greek models and their metres; a text in which due regard is had to textual criticism, and various passages which seem to be alternative versions are printed side by side (see pp. 27, 29, 39, 41); an account of the Phaedra legend and its treatment by dramatists before and after Seneca's time; sixty-eight pages of exegetic commentary, intended mainly for schools; and twenty pages of critical notes—all for the sum of about two shillings. The work seems to me very well done: the only slips I have noticed are an impossible interpretation of *malignus* at l. 16 ('uebelwollender'), and a wrong explanation of *sic* in l. 477, where the meaning is simply: 'so obstinately do we seek death, one would think causes of death were rare.' The explanatory notes seem often very elementary for the kind of student who has proved himself fit to cope with Seneca; they are also overladen with philology, and sometimes they combine both weaknesses—as e.g., in the note on l. 81, '*diva substantivisch=dea*. Aus der Grundform *deivos (vgl. die altlateinische Duenos-Inschrift) entwickelte sich &c.' However, as no important difficulty is left unnoticed, one really has no right to complain.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

Der Stil des Apuleius von Madaura: ein Beitrag zur Stilistik des Spätlateins. By MAX BERNHARD. (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 2.) Pp. xii + 366. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1927. M. 23. THIS is a very valuable book. The author is thoroughly familiar with Apuleius' writings, and has been remarkably successful in classifying and analysing the characteristics of his language and style. The book deals chiefly with the *Metamorphoses*, but there are also good studies, on a smaller scale, of the *Florida*, the *Apologia*, and the authentic philosophical works, and excellent comparisons between these and the *Metamorphoses*. In a book so full of detail it is not surprising to find many small points open to criticism. For instance, in ll. 15, *ut arbitrio nocturni gannitus ablegarentur, gannitus* is clearly genitive singular, not nominative plural (p. 102), though Bernhard could have quoted a true instance of this plural from IV. 1; on p. 125 *anum sed admodum scitulam* (I. 7) and *ferrum querit abscondere sed in suo pectore* (V. 22) should not be included among the examples of the non-adversative use of *sed*; nor should *et nunc iacet noster Lamachus elemento toto sepultus* (IV. 11) be quoted to illustrate the hypallage of the adjective (p. 215). There is a false quantity on p. 247, *adiecit* being scanned $\underline{u}\underline{\underline{\underline{e}}}$; the context shows that this is not a misprint, and the true scansion in fact supports the thesis which Bernhard is here maintaining. The book is beautifully printed and produced, but there are many misprints, such as *asinum* for *animum* (p. 39), *mulierum* for *muliebrium* (p. 193).

Some more general criticisms may fairly be made. The author tends to exaggerate sound points. There is, for instance, far more periodic writing in the *Metamorphoses* than the language of pp. 36 ff. suggests. He seems, too, to exaggerate Apuleius' direct debt to contemporary popular speech, in contrast to the archaic use of consecrated vulgarisms. Some of his classifications are artificially over-elaborate; for example, those of metaphors on pp. 189 ff. Further, his lists of illustrations are sometimes too long or too short; they are not exhaustive, and a smaller number would have established his point. Some striking phrases, such as *puerile corollarium* (III. 20), have escaped the comment which they deserved.

The faults of the book, however, are trivial beside its merits, and it will be invaluable to Apuleian students. There is a good account of the *clausulae*, with full statistics, and a strong case seems to be made out for the view that in Apuleius' prose a final short vowel followed by *m* was reckoned as metrically equivalent to one followed by *n*.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Claudians Gedicht vom Gotenkrieg. Herausgegeben und erklärt von DR. HELMUT SCHROFF. Pp. 86. Reproduction of signet ring gem picturing Alaric. Berlin: Emil Ebering, 1927. RM. 5.40.

THE appearance of an exegetical edition of even one of the longer poems of Claudian is an event of some interest. The nineteenth-century

editions of this poet, those of Jeep, Birt and Koch, are all critical, and for exegesis one has to go back to the admirable but now antiquated Gesner (1759). (The Delphin edition of the younger Burmann [1821] and Artaud's Paris edition of 1824, though derivative and inferior, should at least have been mentioned in the bibliography.)

Dr. Schröff's edition of the Gothic War is a careful and thorough piece of work. An introduction of fourteen pages gives an adequate account of the very confused period that falls between the battles of Adrianople and Pollentia. For the date of this latter battle Dr. Schröff accepts what, since Seck's article in the *Forsch. z. deutsch. Gesch.*, may be called the orthodox view—viz., Easter day 402. It is a pity that the rival theory (Easter 403), accepted by Clinton and ably defended by Dr. Crees (*Claudian as an historical authority*), is passed over almost in silence.

Dr. Schröff is conservative in his text. He departs seldom from Birt, and when he does so it is not as a rule to improve on him. *Levat* (l. 51), though attested by more MSS. than is *leva*, is clearly the worst reading, and the MSS. *belloque* of l. 153 is, as Birt saw, impossible. Considering the *devia rerum* of *de rapt. Pros.* III. 316, Koch's *devia rura*, accepted by Dr. Schröff, is perverse. Ll. 346-348 are difficult, but one doubts whether Dr. Schröff's *tepidis* for *tepidis* really helps matters. In the vexed passage ll. 581-583 Dr. Schröff cuts the Gordian knot by printing Bæhrens' *ductor* for the MSS. *docuit*. This, if arbitrary, at least gives good sense, which is more than can be said for Dr. Schröff's rearrangement of ll. 586-589. The *tamen* of l. 588 to which the editor objects is, if unexpected, at least possible. Dr. Schröff is, however, probably wise in abandoning Birt's *sic* (l. 91) and returning to the MSS. *si*, as he is in accepting, against Birt, Heinsius' *fulva* (l. 223) and *animis receptis* (l. 406) for the MSS. *fulta* and *animi recepti*.

In the matter of exegesis Dr. Schröff is somewhat too generous. His average page contains ten lines of text and forty-four (double column) of notes. These notes consist largely of parallel passages which often try to compensate in bulk for what they lack in illustrative value or even, in some cases, in appositeness. *Inertes dominos* (l. 157), for instance, does not require for its understanding the note: *inertes: schon Naev. carm. frg. 23 homines bellī . . . inertes.* (There is no genitive in the Claudian passage.) For the obvious metaphor *ver . . . viridem reparavit amictum* (l. 168) we are given eight parallel passages. Still more portentous is a note of forty-eight lines in illustration of *galeisque Padum victricibus hausī* (l. 532). But it is ungrateful to complain of being killed by kindness, and the quality of *de bell. Get.* makes us hope that Dr. Schröff, taking *copiaque ipsa nocet* as his motto in exegesis, will follow it up by the complete edition of Claudian that is so long overdue.

M. PLATNAUER.

Die Geschichte (sic) der römischen Dichtung im Zeitalter des Augustus: Erster Teil, Vergil, von KURT WITTE. Pp. viii + 180. Erlangen: Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1927. M. 14.

THE earliest published part of this work was noticed in 1926 (pp. 42 f.) and deals with Tibullus. The main purpose of the present part, which is much larger, is to study the ancient 'form- (or plan-) consciousness' in the *Georgics*. A careful and minute analysis of the poem is provided, in the course of which the author shows that Virgil was not writing a handbook of agriculture, but intended merely to give a poetical treatment of the subject. The sources of the matter, such as the writings of Hesiod and Varro, are set forth. Much of this is, of course, familiar to students of the *Georgics*, but the writer of this work seems to owe little to previous investigators, to whom indeed there are very few references. The treatment of the subject is for the most part independent, and some notable names are severely handled in the last chapter, 'Gestalt und Gehalt,' which is perhaps the most important in the book. The parallels between the different books of the *Georgics* are stated with great fulness. The book is in a measure a protest against minute verbal exegesis, and an exhortation to the study of ancient works according to their general plan. The writer appears to have his own countrymen particularly in view. He makes no reference to the valuable work done on Virgil in this country, and indeed it may be doubted if the lesson he seeks to teach needs enforcement on this side of the channel. The index gives references to passages quoted from Virgil, Horace, and Tibullus.

A. SOUTER.

The Life of Rome: Illustrative Passages from Latin Literature. Selected and translated by H. L. ROGERS and T. R. HARLEY. Being an English edition revised and amplified of *Roman Home Life and Religion*. Pp. xii + 264. With 20 illustrations of Roman antiquities and sites. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1927. 6s. net.

THE earlier work of Messrs. Rogers and Harley, published in 1923, has proved an interesting and useful text-book. In it certain passages were given in Latin and others in English. The present edition is entirely in English, the verse translations being the work of Mr. Rogers, those in prose of Mr. Harley. The passages have been rearranged; eight new passages have been added (Cicero, *De Fin.* III. 2, 7; Tacitus, *Dial.* 28-35; *Agric.* 4, 5; Horace, *Sat.* I. 6, 62-99; Lucretius, VI. 1138-1286; Tacitus, *Agric.* 46; Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* I. 29-31; Hadrian the Emperor, *Anima*); the notes have been curtailed by the omission of those referring to the latinity of the passages; and a number of beautiful illustrations have been added. The whole constitutes a very attractive book, both in matter and in externals, for the translations are admirable. It will perhaps be disconcerting to teachers that something of a 'crib' to the earlier work is thus made accessible to pupils, though the two books are not intended for the same class of readers. There seems to be also a certain clashing with Mr. Cyril Bailey's *Mind*

of *Rome*, recently issued by the same publishers. The editors are still ignorant of the fact that further portions of the so-called 'Laudatio Turiae' were discovered in 1898, and are accessible in *C.I.L.* VI. 31670 (=Dessau 8393: see also *P.W.* XII. 995), Dr. Warde Fowler's article, which they reprint, being thus in part antiquated.

A. SOUTER.

Variatio Sermonis hos Columella: akademisk Avhandling av GUSTAV NYSTROM. Pp. x + 116. Göteborg: Elander, 1926.

THIS treatise is written in Swedish, but will be useful even to those that are ignorant of that language. The extensive bibliography shows that the writer of this doctor's dissertation is well acquainted with most of the best works on Latin diction, though he persistently refers to Linderbauer's commentary on the *Rule of St. Benedict* as 'Lindenbauer.' He has studied Columella's language very thoroughly and collected very many interesting examples of variety of expression, such as *quem paulo ante rettulimus, ut iam prius dixi, ut ante iam dixi*, and suchlike: *macerato . . . contere . . . adicito; M. Tullius, Cicero, M. Cicero; arbusculae, arbores; plurimi, quidam, multi, nonnulli; post, inde, postea; simul atque* (this expression, rare in silver Latin authors, occurs several times in Columella), *cum*; variations in tenses, moods, cases, number, degrees of comparison, etc. It is obvious that a study of this kind can be pursued most easily in the case of a technical author, but it is not without interest to the student of any Latin author, and the semasiologist will find much to interest him in the present investigation. There are good indexes.

A. SOUTER.

The Latinity of the Letters of Saint Ambrose: A Dissertation. By SISTER MIRIAM ANNUNCIATA ADAMS, M.A. Pp. xviii + 140. The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., 1927.

The works of Ambrose have on the whole not been preserved to us in so ancient copies as those of his contemporaries Augustine and Jerome. We shall therefore probably never know his latinity with the same precision as is possible in the case of these. It is nevertheless strange that this writer, with his thoroughly classical education, has attracted so little attention. The late Professor Mayor had studied at least the first volume of the Vienna edition very carefully, as appears from one of his annotated copies of Lewis and Short, but until the Catholic University of America took up the study of Ambrose's latinity, almost nothing had been published on this interesting subject. In the Patristic Studies of that University four contributions on Ambrose have now appeared.

There are two possible methods of investigation. One would be to take up some topics and illustrate them right through the works of Ambrose. The other, which the Catholic University has adopted, is to take one work or one section of the works and study it separately. The Epistles form a very considerable body of

Latin, and Sister Miriam has compared them with classical Latin idiom, as set forth in the works of Dräger, Kühner-Stegmann and Stolz-Schmalz. There is much in her volume for which we ought to be thankful, but there are a number of errors both of omission and commission. In a number of places she has failed to note that Scripture is being quoted, and treats the language of Scripture as that of Ambrose himself. There are far too many misprints and too many wrong references (for instance, letter 63 is persistently referred to as letter 64). She has not cast her net wide enough for parallels in other authors. There is no discussion of the predicative dative, though its later development is interesting, as recent articles in the *Bulletin Du Cange* show; adjectives and participles are sometimes confused (pp. 59 ff.); *concertatus*

(p. 69) is fourth declension substantive, not a participle; *dormientes* (p. 69) is nominative, not accusative, and *transitum* (p. 102) is not the participle, but the fourth declension noun; *lectum* (p. 107), from 73, 1, not 74, 1, is participle, not noun; *appone* has dropped out after *notam* (p. 115). What is most serious of all is that a number of interesting features are not mentioned at all, unless the index be very defective; for example, *alimonia* (41, 11; 63, 81), *appetentia* (63, 14; 63, 72), *arula* (63, 53), *coquinio* (63, 37; 63, 63), *cremum* (44, 11), *eo usque* (63, 84), *epitome* (63, 13), *executor* (41, 11), *immugio* (63, 55), *inlecebrosum* (67, 5), *inguinamentum* (63, 104), *inaratus* (44, 11), *mitifco* (63, 59), *molliculus* (63, 97), *protelo* (63, 65), *templa-*
mentum (63, 15; 63, 74), *uerno* (63, 69).

A. SOUTER.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,

In your February number there appeared a review against which I feel bound to protest, by Professor Rose, of a little book of mine on *The Week*. As a whole, the review was a mixture of good and bad, though with the bad so put in the forefront that a casual reader might easily get the impression that the book was worthless. The only phrase, however, I wish to challenge is a statement that the book had 'many mistakes in detail.' No mistakes were specified, and I wrote to ask the reviewer for fuller information. I received some twenty notes, nearly all of which were concerned with

points which Professor Rose thought I might have with advantage introduced, or which he himself would have treated differently. Apart from one doubtful matter—my use of the word 'primitive,' which he would restrict to savages and I have used in a wider sense—the 'many mistakes' come down to the following: (1) I have printed the Welsh week-day names as Dydd-sul, etc., instead of Dydd Sul; (2) in one place *Corp. Lat. Inscr.* appears instead of *Corp. Inscr. Lat.*; (3) *Real Encycl.* has been misprinted as *Real Cycl.*

I am, etc.,

F. H. COLSON.

CAMBRIDGE,
August, 1927.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Armytage (D.) Christianity in the Roman world, its rise and progress to the fall of the Western Empire. Pp. ix+281. London: G. Bell, 1927. Cloth, 5s.

Arnum (M.) Index verborum a Philone Byzantio in Mechanicae Syntaxis libris quarto quinto exhibitorum. Pp. viii+90. Leipzig: Teubner, 1927. Paper, 5.60 M. (bound, 6.60 M.).

Baker (G. P.) *Sulla the Fortunate: the Great Dictator.* Being an essay on politics in the form of a historical biography. Pp. 320; portraits, maps, and diagrams. London: John Murray, 1927. Cloth, 16s. net.

Baly (C. W.) Attic Life. Scenes from the court speeches of Demosthenes, selected and edited. Pp. ix+79. London: Christopher, Cloth, 3s. 6d.

Beyer (O.) Die Katakombenwelt. Grundriss, Ursprung und Idee der Kunst in der römischen Christengemeinde. Pp. viii + 153; Textbilder, 29 Tafeln. Tübingen: Mohr, 1927. Paper.

Braithwaite (A. W.) C. Suetoni Tranquilli Divus Vespasianus, with an introduction and commentary. Pp. xx+73. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.

Buecheler (F.) Kleine Schriften. Zweiter Band. Pp. vi + 518. Leipzig: Teubner, 1927. Paper, 18 M. (bound, 20 M.).

Burck (E.) De Vergili Georgicon Partibus Iussivis (Diss. Inaug.) pp. 103. Typis R. Berger Luckaensis (Th.) 1926.

Casson (S.) Essays in Aegean Archaeology. Presented to Sir Arthur Evans in honour of his 75th birthday. Edited by S. C. Pp. ix + 142; xxi plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927. Cloth, 15s. net.

Classical Philology. Vol. XXII, No. 3. July 1927.

Dalton (O. M.) The History of the Franks by Gregory of Tours. Translated with an introduction. Vol. I (introduction), pp. xii + 447; vol. II (text), pp. iv + 660, 1 map. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1927. Cloth, 40s. net.

Diehl (E.) Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres. Vol. II, fasc. 6 et 7. Pp. x, 401-516. Berlin : Weidmann, 1927. Paper, 6 m.

Drew (D. L.) The Allegory of the Aeneid. Pp. vi + 101. Oxford : Blackwell, 1927. Cloth, 6s. net.

Gercke (A.) und Norden (E.) Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft. I. Band, 2. Heft : Textkritik, von P. Maas ; pp. 18. I. Band, Supplement : Vorwort, Inhaltsverzeichnis, Nachträge, Register ; pp. xvi + 36. Leipzig : Teubner, 1927. Kartonierte, 1.20 M., 2.40 M.

Godley (A. D.) Fifty Poems. Edited by C. L. Graves and C. R. L. Fletcher. Pp. xii + 125. London : Milford, 1927. Cloth, 5s. net.

Henderson (B. W.) Five Roman Emperors. Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, Nerva, Trajan. A.D. 69-117. Pp. xiii + 357 ; 4 maps. Cambridge : University Press, 1927. Cloth, 21s. net.

Hohl (E.) Scriptores Historiae Augustae. (Bibl. Scr. Graec. et Rom. Teubn.) 2 vols. Pp. xvi + 305, 304. Leipzig : Teubner, 1927. Paper, 10 M. (bound, 12 M.) each.

Hudson-Williams (T.) Groeg y Testament Newydd, hyfforddwr Cymraeg gan T. H.-W. Pp. 77. Wrexham : Hughes, 1927. Cloth.

Ilberg (J.) Sorani Gynaeciorum libri IV, De signis fracturarum, De fasciis, Vita Hippocratis secundum Soranum. (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum IV.) Pp. xxii + 282, xviii plates. Leipzig : Teubner, 1927. Paper, 22 M. (bound, 24 M.).

Kern (O.) Die griechischen Mysterien der klassischen Zeit. Pp. ix + 79. Berlin : Weidmann, 1927. Paper, 3.60 M.

Lang (R. S.) P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon Liber XII. Edited with an introduction and commentary. Pp. xxviii + 114. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1927. Cloth, 45. 6d. net.

Laqueur (R.) Epigraphische Untersuchungen. Pp. v + 211. Leipzig : Teubner, 1927. Paper, 10 M. (bound, 12 M.).

Morel (W.) Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum. (Bibl. Scr. Graec. et Rom. Teubn.) Pp. vi + 190. Leipzig : Teubner, 1927. Paper, 6 M. (bound, 7.20 M.).

Movreioī. Anno IV, Fascicolo I. 1927.

Nairn (J. A.) Greek Prose Composition. Pp. ix + 219. Cambridge : University Press, 1927. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

Nobili (A. C.) The Pronunciation of the Classical Latin C and G. 2nd edition. Pp. 84. Smerillo (Italy) and Chicago, 1927. Paper.

Palaeographia Latina, Part V. Edited by W. M. Lindsay. (St. Andrews University Publications, XXIII.) Pp. 79; ix plates. London : Milford, 1927. Paper, 5s. net.

Palata (F.) Horae subseciae. Carmina poetarum recentiorum, imprimis Bohemicorum, Latinis versibus reddita. Pp. 25. Třebíč (Moravia) : J. F. Kubes, 1926. Paper, 6 Kč.

Platt (A.) Nine Essays. With a preface by A. E. Housman. Pp. xviii + 220. Cambridge : University Press, 1927. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

Randall-MacIver (D.) The Etruscans. Pp. 152; illustrations. Oxford : University Press, 1927. Cloth, 6s. net.

Salonius (A. H.) Die Griechen und das Griechische in Petronis Cena Trimalchionis. Pp. 38. (Societas Scientiarum Fennica : Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum II. 1.) Helsingfors : Akademische Buchhandlung ; Leipzig : Harrasowitz, 1927. Paper.

Séchan (L.) Le Dévouement d'Alceste. Pp. 52. Paris : Boivin, 1927. Paper.

Seckel (E.) and Kuebler (B.) Iurisprudentia Anteiusitiana II. 2. (Bibl. Scr. Graec. et Rom. Teubn.) Pp. 189-543. Leipzig : Teubner, 1927. Paper, 14 M. (bound, 16 M.).

Suess (W.) Petronii imitatio sermonis plebei qua necessitate coniungatur cum grammatica illius aetatis doctrina. Pp. 103. (Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis [Dorpatensis] B XIII. 1.) Dorpat : Matiesen, 1927. Paper.

Symbola Osloenses, Fasc. V. Ediderunt S. Etitem et G. Rudberg. Pp. 87. Oslo : Some, 1927. Paper.

Täubler (E.) Die Archaeologie des Thukydides. Pp. ii + 139. Leipzig : Teubner, 1927. Paper, 6 M. (bound, 8 M.).

The American Journal of Philology. Vol. XLVIII. 3. Whole No. 191. July, Aug., Sept., 1927.

The Journal of Roman Studies. Vol. XVI. Part 2. 1926.

Ure (P. N.) Sixth and Fifth Century Pottery from Rhitsona. Pp. ix + 111 ; XXV plates. (Reading University Studies.) London : Milford, 1927. Cloth, 21s. net.

Uzkull-Gyllenband (W. Graf) Plutarch und die griechische Biographie. Studien zu plutarckischen Lebenbeschreibungen des V. Jahrhunderts. Pp. vii + 120. Stuttgart : Kohlhammer, 1927. Paper.

Voces (G.) Esquisses grecques. Pp. 152. Paris : Maisonneuve Frères, 1927. Paper.

Wace (A. J. B.) A Cretan statuette in the Fitzwilliam Museum. A study in Minoan costume. Pp. 49 ; XIII plates, 2 text-figures. Cambridge : University Press, 1927. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

Way (A. S.) Aristophanes in English Verse. Vol. I. Pp. xxiv + 382. London : Macmillan, 1927. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

Wight Duff (J.) A Literary History of Rome from the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age. First cheap edition. Pp. xvi + 695. London : Fisher Unwin, 1927. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (U. von) Das homerische Epos. Pp. 22. Berlin : Weidmann, 1927. Paper, 1 M.

Wolfe (H.) Others Abide. Pp. 119. London : Benn, 1927. Boards, 6s. net (de luxe, 15s.).

